

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is not every day that we get an outstanding book, but here is a book which deserves to be read and pondered in all the churches.

It is a book written at the request of the International Missionary Council in order to serve as material for the World Missionary Conference to be held in Madras this year. Its aim is to 'state the fundamental position of the Christian Church as a witness-bearing body in the modern world.' Very wisely was the Council guided to commit this task to Professor Hendrik KRAEMER of Leiden, who has produced a really noble book under the title of *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World* (Edinburgh House Press; 8s. 6d. net).

The primary aim of the book is to give guidance to those who are engaged in the missionary work of the Church and are faced with the manifold problems of the non-Christian world. It surveys the present religious situation in the non-Christian world, gives an incisive analysis of non-Christian systems of life and thought, and defines the Christian attitude towards the non-Christian religions.

But it does much more. It goes down to the fundamentals, and its supreme excellence is that it is so profoundly Christian from first to last. The older churches at home as well as the younger churches in the mission field are living in a non-Christian environment, and are urgently called to a deeper understanding of the Christian message and a more courageous presentation of the Christian ethic. With this whole critical situation Professor KRAEMER deals in a singularly fresh and suggestive way, and his exposition of the Christian message is intel-

lectually stimulating and heart-searching to an extraordinary degree.

'In the midst of the cataclysmic events of the modern world and the meeting with great non-Christian religions in their state of partial disintegration and partial reconstruction, the Christian Church needs a clear consciousness of its faith.' Before the divine message can be rightly translated and interpreted it must first be understood. Now the only source from which this knowledge of the Christian faith can be drawn is the Word of God. For the Christian faith is not a philosophy nor a series of religious and moral ideas, but it is based on the revelation of a series of divine acts. It is primarily historical; it comes in the form of a story. It has engendered many ideas, concepts and experiences, but these are never adequate to the revelation from which they flow. 'This world of divine revelational acts cannot be explained in terms of human evolution as ideas that have developed, but can only be stated in the form of a story. . . . Therefore, to the Bible we will turn, because there the witness of the prophets and apostles is to be found on which the Church is built.'

Now to get into line with Bible thought is not so easy as it seems. 'The reason for this is obviously that the religious and moral universe which we enter in the Bible is radically different from what we meet anywhere else and also from our natural habits of thinking, even our so-called "Christian" thinking.' The Bible is radically religious, because radically theocentric. 'God, His holy Will, His acts, His love, His judgment, is the beginning and the end of all. Man and the world are brought in

direct, immediate relation to this God, who always takes the initiative.' Many efforts have been made to insert the Christian faith in the great immanent process of human creativity in the field of religion, but it constantly eludes these endeavours. Its origins are irreducible. The Bible offers no philosophy or ethical system or world view. Doubtless, ideas about the personality of God, the infinite value of man and the call to a higher life are derived from the Bible. But it is 'an adulteration of the concrete and radical religious realism of the Bible and the Christian faith to take these derivatives as the essential and abiding invariables of the Gospel.' The essential message and content of the Bible is always the Living, eternally active God, the indubitable Reality, from whom, by whom, and to whom all things are, and it challenges man in his total being to confront himself with this reality and take decisions accordingly.

As the supreme interest of Bible writers is religious, and not metaphysical or philosophical, or even theological, they offer no theory about revelation, yet it is the pre-supposition upon which their whole witness is built. And by revelation they mean not simply enlightenment or a sudden intuitive insight or a luminous idea or knowledge about occult facts, but something quite radical and absolute and *sui generis*. 'Revelation in its proper sense is what is by its nature inaccessible and remains so, even when it is revealed. The necessary correlate to the concept of revelation is therefore faith. It lies in the very nature of divine revelation that the only organ for apprehending it is faith; and for the same reason faith, in this strictly religious sense, can only be appropriately defined as at the same time a divine gift and a human act.' Revelation in Christ is a free divine act of redemptive irruption into the life of man and of the world, a tale about the wonderful things God has done. Therefore, along with faith, there must also go witness-bearing. The divine story must be told. Those who have believed with the heart must confess with the lips. This is the very *raison d'être* of the Church.

What, then, is the heart of the Christian message which the Church believes and preaches? It may

be variously expressed, but probably it will best accord with Biblical realism to 'take as a starting-point the answer of Peter after his first missionary speech, when many people asked him, "What are we to do?" He answered, "Repent, let each of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins." Jesus Christ and the remission of sins are the divine elements; repentance is the human element in the structure of the Christian faith.' The joyful news that rings through the gospel is of the forgiveness of sins, a never-ending wonder, a miracle of God's free and sovereign grace. It is the grossest misunderstanding to take it as a matter of course. Human reason may argue that, if God is love, surely forgiveness is the most obvious thing to happen. 'It is not. At any rate not if one wants to be radical and earnest as the Bible is, which disregards all our human diluted conceptions of love, of forgiveness, and of God. God's love is holy love, and therefore radical love. Because God loves man the sinner, radically, He condemns him radically. His holy condemnation of sin and the sinner is a sign of His love, because disregarding the reality of sin would be indulgence, not love. It would mean destroying holiness, on which depends the validity of all moral life.'

This forgiveness is made possible through the incarnation and work of Jesus Christ. Without doubt 'Jesus represents His own person and work as central in His whole message.' He confidently claimed the supreme place in God's plan for the world. And from the day of His resurrection the Church has borne witness to the divine victory over sin and death, inviting everyone to believe in Him and thereby share in this victory and in the new life in the Spirit. 'Jesus is Lord' is the apostolic testimony, and His people wait with joyous expectation the manifestation of His glory and the coming of His Kingdom in its fullness.

'The dominant point in the Christian ethic is the same as in the Christian faith. It is embedded in the same sphere of concrete religious realism, and is, like the Christian faith, radically religious and theocentric. Consequently it is, just like the Christian faith, entirely incommensurable with all other ethics in the world.' Its root and inspiration

are in the redeeming love of God in Christ. It is not asceticism or moral heroism; it is the natural fruit of the Spirit. In its essence it is spontaneous, free, serene, victorious. It issues in love to man since 'our fellow-man as such has infinite value because he is God's creature, and he is to be loved because of this fact and because it is God's will. Therefore the love of enemies and of the most disgusting and hopeless of men is, in the sphere of this radically theocentric ethic, as natural as the shining of the sun.'

Facing a non-Christian world, as the Church does to-day, a clear and vigorous conception of what the Christian faith is and stands for is a matter of life and death. Man's religious thinking is confused as never before with conflicting world views and impressive claims of ethnic religions. 'Everywhere in the Christian Church, in the West and in the East, there arises the cry for theology, real theology, in order to give a new and much-needed sense of direction and consistency to Christian thinking, feeling and willing . . . It ought, therefore, to be repeated with the strongest emphasis possible that the prime necessity in this situation is a *religious* confrontation with and orientation upon the radical religious realism of the Bible. This means to expose the totality of our being to the claim of the Biblical revelation for absolute allegiance to it—half-hearted allegiance means no allegiance at all—and then to take decisions.'

Dr. H. L. GOUDGE was led to think at the Edinburgh Conference of 1937 on Faith and Order that in important respects Catholics and Protestants are nearer together than they used to be. But while at Edinburgh agreements and disagreements were registered, a real effort is needed to get rid of the disagreements. And in the concluding chapters of an interesting and refreshing volume he would indicate the changes necessary both in the Roman Church and in other communions if the great cause of the reunion of Christendom is to be substantially furthered.

The volume is entitled *The Church of England and Reunion* (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net), and is

animated by the conviction not only of the necessity of reunion but of the mediating part which the Church of England ought to play. In the first portion of the work the present situation is critically surveyed; in the second portion, the doctrine of the Church and Ministry is constructively expounded; while in the third portion the problem of reunion is practically considered. It is part of the third portion that we would here summarize.

The purpose of God is the creation of a perfect society in an environment fitted for it, and not the creation of a number of mutually independent 'saints' or independent communities. If the Church is to realize that purpose, it must be one visible community, with a life of its own, standing out clearly against the background of the world, witnessing to God, and attracting the world to Him by the glory of its life. With such presuppositions our author is naturally led to affirm that among Christian communions the Church of Rome best corresponds to the divine purpose.

In some respects Apostolic Christianity is preserved in the Roman Church more faithfully than anywhere else. Not only is the Roman Church the great visible society that the Church is meant to be, but it overrides national distinctions and class distinctions in a remarkable way, and in an equally remarkable way witnesses to all the truths of the Christian faith. But in two important respects the Roman Church does not correspond to 'the pattern in the mount.' The first is its toleration, and even support, of the Mediterranean paganism which entered the Church when it became the religion of the Empire. The second is the autocratic spirit inherited from that Empire itself.

We shall not follow Dr. GOUDGE in his exposition under the first head of the cult of Mary. He appears to suggest that, on the one hand, the best and wisest Roman Catholics would go back to a time before the belief arose that the mind of Mary, like the minds of the divinities whom she supplanted, was universal; and that, on the other hand, with the doctrine of the Communion of Saints again coming into its own outside the Roman and Eastern Churches, a fuller recognition is being accorded of

the place held by the Blessed Virgin in the purpose of God.

Nor shall we follow our author in his exposition under the second head of the Roman claim to authority. He indulges the hope that in time this claim, which interferes with the claims of conscience and of God, will be abandoned. Nowadays the Holy Father is only regarded as infallible under conditions which hardly ever occur. The ultimate authority belongs in fact to the Church in union with the Holy Father, and not to the Holy Father himself. And a meaning may be given to the infallibility of the Church which is in accordance with the New Testament teaching, and on which the various communions may be united. The teaching which the Church as a whole has given throughout the centuries, and which its members have accepted, we may take to be, if not infallible, 'as little removed from infallibility as is no matter.'

'If the changes for which we hope pass over the Roman Church, it will be comparatively easy for the rest of Christendom to enter into union with it, and even to give to the Bishop of Rome, not only recognition as the chief Bishop of Christendom, but functions in relation to the whole Church which will be invaluable for the preservation of discipline and unity.'

So far the Roman Church. What now of the changes necessary in other communions? As a step toward reunion the Church of England and Protestant communions must begin, says Dr. GOUDGE, to rid themselves of three characteristics—individualism, indiscipline, and nationalism.

Individualism he regards as the first and greatest obstacle to reunion. It is the great curse of Protestantism and of Anglicanism, and not least of Anglo-Catholics. While we cannot surrender either our individual judgment or our individual conscience, we should profoundly mistrust both when we find them out of harmony with those of our fellow-Christians.

Individualism leads to indiscipline, which is widely prevalent in the Church of England and among Protestants generally. At the Edinburgh

Conference the suggestion that it was the duty of the Church to discipline the lives of its members occasioned much laughter. 'What Calvin, not to say St. Paul, would have thought of this passes imagination.' But it is the natural result of the view that it is our individual welfare, and not the welfare of the Church as a whole, with which we should be primarily concerned.

As for nationalism, the third characteristic commonly found in churches outside the Roman obedience, it still shows itself in a strong tendency at least to put the welfare of the nation rather than that of the universal Church into the foreground of thought and effort. Despite the large exodus of the world from it, the Church of England is by no means free as yet from nationalism. But, as secular education and freedom of thought grow, the identification of the churches with the nations will pass away to the decrease of their members and the increase of their purity. Healthful reunion may have to wait for that.

Dr. GOUDGE's positions are apt sometimes to be misunderstood, and in any case they will hardly meet with universal acceptance; but he must be given the credit of his conviction that the reunion of the Church of God is a far more important work than the endeavour to apply Christian principles to national and international life. These principles, as he urges, are not likely to be understood or accepted unless they are first illustrated, and their successful working demonstrated, in the life of the Church itself.

The significance of the rise of the Totalitarian State for Christianity has been so often referred to in these 'Notes' that some readers may be a little tired of the subject. Yet it is a matter of such vital importance that we make no apology for returning to it, whenever a noteworthy pronouncement on the topic is made.

One of the most suggestive utterances is that of Professor André PHILIP, a learned member of the French Chamber of Deputies, who was invited to deliver the 'Burge Memorial Lecture' for the current year, and whose Lecture on *Christianity*

and Present Day International Relations is published with an 'Introduction' by the Master of Balliol (S.C.M.; 6d. net). His views are of interest as those of one distinguished both as a Christian philosopher and a practical politician.

The philosophy latent in the notion of a Totalitarian State may be, and often is, criticised as an infringement of the value of personality. In that there is obvious truth. The difficulty, however, emerges that in practice Democracies, too, are endlessly engaged in curtailing individual liberties. One is 'regimented' in all sorts of ways whether one lives in Britain or in Germany; and it might be argued that in actual practice for the average individual, Fascism or Nazism or Russian Communism is only some degrees more thorough than our so-called Democracy in limiting individual freedom.

That the problem of individual freedom is a very old one, and a very complex one, Professor PHILIP is well aware; and his criticism of Totalitarianism is not primarily on the ground of violation of human right. He does not plead for individual freedom. On the contrary, he pleads for complete surrender. Only the surrender must not be made to Society, nor to Nation, nor to State. It must be made to God; and his criticism of Totalitarianism just is that it demands a giving to Caesar of what is due to God. The State or the Nation, in fact, usurps the place of God. Totalitarianism is a neo-paganism. In Germany the Nation is God, and Hitler is His prophet.

God is the only absolute Sovereign—that is the Christian view. Society, and Nation, and State have their due place. One may truly enough say that they are ordained of God. But they are not sovereign for the Christian. In serving them he will be mindful that for him the supreme consideration is the Will of God.

Such necessary entities as Society, Nation, and State are of mixed composition. They are constituted by *sinful* humanity. Here Professor PHILIP takes the same view as Reinhold Niebuhr in his 'Burge' Lecture last year. The State can too

easily become 'demonic,' and when it is conceived as itself the supreme end, it is certain to become so.

Christians then, says Professor PHILIP, 'have to be united in a solemn condemnation in the name of God's sovereignty of every form of Totalitarian State, Nation, or Society.'

But we live in a world alongside Totalitarian States. What is to govern our attitude towards, or our dealings with, them? We are in the world and have our part to play, and no Christian dare shirk his responsibilities as, in the Professor's view, some Pacifists seem to do. That is the first thing the Christian must realize—his personal responsibility for what is happening in the world.

His second recommendation is not to over-emphasize the value of non-violence. It sometimes succeeds, sometimes it does not. Our pacifist friends will find this a hard saying, but many are saying it, and with some reason. The Professor is convinced that had the Democracies acted differently when Japan invaded Manchuria, the story of Abyssinia and of China would have been different.

That, of course, takes us into a highly controversial sphere and we should be sorry if the Professor's *political* views diverted any from consideration of his *religious* views. Christians may differ among themselves as to technical details in the solution of any actual problem, but all need to be recalled to the sense of God's sovereignty, their own responsibility, and the essence of the Christian attitude to the bewildering situations with which a rapidly changing world confronts us.

One of the most suggestive things in the Lecture emerges here. We have erred, we are told, in asking what is the Christian 'rule,' or even what is the Christian 'principle,' to be applied in the solution of a problem. Christ did not lay down rules or expound 'principles.' He inculcated an 'attitude' to life and its problems. He was not a 'moralist,' who came with new rules. He came to bring communion with a Father instead of obedience to a rule.

The Greek Style of St. Paul.

BY THE REVEREND R. MARTIN POPE, M.A., B.D., UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, SOUTHAMPTON.

READERS of Peake's lecture on 'Paul the Apostle: his Personality and Achievement,' reprinted in the *Bulletin of John Rylands Library*, 1928, will recall his reference to the opinion expressed by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff on St. Paul as 'a classic of Hellenism.'

This was a striking testimony from one of the most brilliant and learned of German classical scholars given in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, 232 (1912, Leipzig-Berlin). It is quoted with approval by Johannes Weiss in his *History of Primitive Christianity*, which has recently been translated under that title from the original to the great benefit of English readers, and contains a penetrating study of Pauline style by one of the most enlightened critics of the Apostle's writing. It is worth while to turn to Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's critique. He believed that while St. Paul never borrowed directly from Hellenic culture, yet there could have been no St. Paul without Hellenism. His textbook was the Greek Bible, and he thought only in Greek, while remaining to the end 'a Jew, as Jesus Christ was a Jew . . . he is great because of what he inherited from his own people, but more especially because of what is particularly his own self as opposed to the Greek.' He then proceeds to point out that his Greek has nothing in common with any school or model, but 'flows straight from the heart, clumsily, a hasty sputter, yet real Greek—no translation from the Aramaic, like the sayings of Jesus.' The phrasing suggests a mountain stream moving to a definite goal but in its course broken by interposing stones into eddies and twists. This may be accepted as a vivid figure of St. Paul's style, especially in the two Corinthian Epistles where the soul of the Apostle throbbing with varied emotions of sorrow and joy, sternness and gentleness, speaks now in tones of remonstrance and strong condemnation and now in those of gratitude and hope. There is no parallel to his Greek style in his predecessors or in contemporary Hellenistic writers. Philo of Alexandria (died c. A.D. 41) has often been brought into comparison with Paul, and Prof. A. D. Nock in his recent *St. Paul* has made a well-balanced statement of the relationship between them. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, who gives a brief critique of Philo immediately preceding that of St. Paul, expresses an unfavourable opinion of him. His Judaism appears to be half-hearted:

he puts on two different masks in his endeavour to present the Torah in terms of Greek philosophy to his contemporaries, and in this way discloses his immunity from the fanaticism of his compatriots. The faith of his fathers sinks into the background, while he displays himself to the public at large as a scholar used to all the forms of philosophic writers in a style which is 'the same throughout, grandiose, rhetorical, well-constructed, overflowing with words, hardly the first beginnings of Atticism, a link between Posidonius and Plutarch if such a link could be constructed.' Others take a more favourable view of Philo, but that he influenced St. Paul has never been established, though it is not unlikely that the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Fourth Gospel owed something to the teaching of the Jewish Alexandrian school, even if certain elements in the Philonic system—such as his view of the Logos—were entirely alien to Christian thought. Philo is an imitator of Greek models both in thought and style, while St. Paul's style is all his own. None of the epithets applied to Philo by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff could be fitly used of the Apostle's style. His familiarity with the LXX left its mark on his diction, especially the Wisdom writers, whose exposition of ethical maxims is set forth in the typically Semitic forms of parallelism and antithesis. Perhaps actual Semitisms are less noticeable in St. Paul than in St. Mark and the other Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel. Some mannerisms, such as his extended use of the preposition *ἐν* (often like the Hebrew *בְּ*), and the use of the genitive of definition in such phrases as *θάνατος σταυροῦ*, are typically Semitic (see for others, Moulton and Howard *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, ii. 413-485).

What, then, entitled the Apostle to the place of a 'classic'? Certain it is that the form of his writings, the Epistle, was a new feature. It is not a personal letter like the papyri letters: even the private letter to Philemon has a certain carefreeness of expression as befitting a judgment of momentous import on an aspect of the Christian ethic. 'Nor is it literature, it is some inimitable mixture,' says Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: but I question if he does not go too far in adding, 'he has no artistic vein.' He deprecates and counters the obvious objection that may be raised against this verdict

from the example of the Hymn of Love which has to most readers more than a touch of artistry: for he considers that he employs the same 'rhetorical figures' which are used in the speech of Agathon in Plato's *Symposium*—an interesting reference to which we shall return—but, on the other hand, confesses that 'the formlessness of his style is refreshing in a world of conventional forms, polished beauty and platitudes.' He adds the opinion which will not carry conviction to all minds that Plato, while he would have acknowledged the value of Paul's religious personality, would have been out of sympathy with him because of his lack of form and because he was not a Greek.

It has to be admitted that there is a lack of regularity and smoothness in the sentences of the Apostle and both *anacoluthon* and *aposiopesis* interrupt their grammatical construction. But here we may quote Jowett, who in his Preface to the *Dialogues of Plato*, p. xx, remarks on 'the ear and intelligence of the Greeks for long and complicated sentences which is rarely found in modern nations,' and adds that 'there was nothing shocking to the contemporary of Thucydides and Plato in anacolutha and repetitions,' though in later Greek the tendency was towards simplification and precision.

Deissmann always insisted on the non-literary style of the Apostle, e.g. in *Paulus* (Eng. Tr., *St. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*, 53). It was a sort of obsession with him that St. Paul was a man of the people and a member of the artisan non-literary classes, explaining his 'large letters' (Gal 6¹¹) as the writing of a workman's hand deformed by toil. Yet he separates him from the proletarian class, and admits that the evidence of contemporary papyri reveals a superiority in his vocabulary which lifts him above colloquialism. This is certainly a noteworthy feature of his style: e.g., in 1 Co 13 we find at least nine expressions which are without parallel in the Greek Testament. By all students this chapter and the closing verses of Ro 8³¹ are singled out as showing marks of careful workmanship and suggest a certain deliberateness in the choice of words and real literary craftsmanship. It is, in fact, the variety of his vocabulary which rather discounts the argument based on the number of *hapax legomena* in the Pastoral Epistles which has been often urged against the authenticity of those writings. Nägeli's monograph on the 'word-treasury' of the Pauline writings illustrates the wealth of the Pauline word-system. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf concludes by the statement that the classics created classics only on Latin soil, while Greek had long passed its artistic prime, even if

Paul, Epictetus, and Plotinus wrote in that language from the heart.

If, then, the evidence of style leads to the conclusion that Pauline Greek is that of his age, when the Greek language had been and continued to be subject to the influences arising out of the mingling of races in the Græco-Roman world, it yet remains an individual achievement in the Epistles, which became a powerful medium of direct personal appeal. Exposition and doctrine found expression in terms which were accompanied by entreaty, exhortation, reproof, condemnation, and judgment as the conditions of the community required or evoked. Never was there a clearer example of the truth that 'the style is the man.' The Greek may be faulty, broken, rapid: yet the writer rises at times to artistry of a remarkable order while his spiritual intensity will ever seem to be worth more than classic ease and elegance. Jowett considered that an 'interminable marsh' succeeded the classic age of Greek literature: 'only in Plutarch, in Lucian, in Longinus, in the Roman emperors Marcus Aurelius and Julian, in some of the Christian Fathers are there any traces of good sense or originality or any power of arousing the interest of later ages.' The nature of the language in which the New Testament was written does not enter into his survey: but it is to be remarked that in his introduction to *The Dialogues of Plato* he frequently adduces parallels with St. Paul, especially in the group which contains the *Symposium* and the *Phaedrus*. And here one may quote the testimony of Edward Norden in his *Die griechische Kunstprosa* (quoted by J. Weiss *op. cit.*), who in speaking of the noble earnestness and enthusiasm of the Apostle adds that 'the diction of the Apostle in such forms as 1 Co 13 and Ro 8³¹ rises to the height of the Platonic *Phaedrus*.'

It is sometimes stated that St. Paul's quotations, like those from Menander in 1 Co 15³³ and Epimenides in Tit 12, are mere popular tags, and the quotation from Aratus of Soli (or possibly from the Hymn of Cleanthes)—τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἑσμέν (Ac 17²⁸)—may be due to Luke his reporter. But it is surely not impossible that St. Paul as a young man at Tarsus became acquainted with some of the Greek classics, and that if he listened to Stoic lecturers who had been trained in the school of Athenodorus of Tarsus, he would become acquainted with the thought of Plato, which influenced the Stoic creed, moral and religious. Undoubtedly, Stoicism left a mark alike on his mind and his language even if he never had actual contact with Seneca. The diatribes of Epictetus (died

c. A.D. 150), as recorded by Arrian, show traces of the influence of the N.T. writings and contain parallels in expression and thought, although there is no proof that Epictetus was well disposed towards Christianity or had read its literature. It is, of course, in the ethical teaching of St. Paul that we are reminded of the elements of Roman Stoicism, which had a healthy effect on the social life of the early empire.

The speech of Agathon given in the *Symposium*, referred to above, is on the theme of love and contains expressions which strike the reader as curious anticipations of St. Paul's treatment—e.g. 'love is our lord who sends courtesy and sends away discourtesy, who gives kindness ever and never gives unkindness, the friend of the good, the wonder of the wise, the amazement of the gods . . . regardful of the good, regardless of the evil—saviour, pilot, comrade, helper, glory of gods and men, leader best and brightest, in whose footsteps let every man follow . . .' (Jowett's translation). But Plato rises to a greater height in the speech of Diotima as reported by Socrates, where love attains the perfect vision of beauty by an ascent 'from fair practices to fair notions, until from fair notions he arrives at the notion of absolute beauty and at last knows what the essence of beauty is' (*ib.*). Perhaps, however, the closing prayer of Socrates in the *Phaedrus* affords a clearer parallel with St. Paul's distinction between flesh and spirit when he says, 'Give me beauty in the inward soul and may the outward and inward man be at one' (*ib.*). Another parallel with the noblest forms of classical thought may be quoted from the *Antigone* (454-5) of Sophocles: here the heroine in a famous passage claims that 'the unwritten and unfailing statutes of heaven are more binding than mortal decrees'; similarly, St. Paul allows to the Gentile world without the law 'the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith' (Ro 2¹⁵).

Such links with the deepest aspirations of the Greek mind are powerfully suggestive to those who believe with the Greek theologians that the Logos or Word-Reason of God was leading man's spirit through the ages to Christ, informing the intellect of prophet and philosopher—an Isaiah and a Plato alike. τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα αἰώνια (2 Co 4¹⁸) is the essence

of Platonism, and when we pass from St. Paul to Plotinus, we discover that the Greek language is the medium of a mystic philosophy which powerfully influenced mediæval thinkers like the Areopagite and Scotus Erigena and to-day is the subject of the fresh and absorbing contemplation of many minds.

It is, then, on the ground not of the Greek style of the Apostle but of his passionate gospel of redemption set forth in a popular idiom but bearing the stamp of his own individuality that the judgment of Wilamowitz-Moellendorf and others may be justified that St. Paul was 'a classic of Hellenism.' The Epistle, a new form of literature, was fashioned by a master hand into

. . . a trumpet; whence he blew
Soul-animating strains—alas, too few!

At his best, as E. Norden says, he gave to the Greek language 'that which for hundreds of years had been lost, the earnestness and enthusiasm of a man who has been inspired by union with his God, such as we only meet in Plato and, finally, Cleanthes.' But the Platonic vision of reality and the Stoic hymn to the First of the Immortals have given way to something more profound and more satisfying for human need. Plato had indeed sublimated the Greek term *eros* and setting it free from degrading associations, identified it with the contemplation of the Eternal Beauty. St. Paul chose another term *ἀγάπη* and brought it into harmony with the concept of personality which was never grasped by Greek philosophy. God was a Person, and God was Love. Love was greater than *γνώσις*, the central motive of all the mystery cults, and in the Person of Christ in whom the union of God and man was perfected the redemption of the world was achieved. His was the Name above every name at which 'every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.' Henceforth 'every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' To the advocacy of this truth which had made him a new man, the Apostle dedicated his life, leaving as the monument of his labours the letters which hold a secure place in the supreme literature of the world.

Some Theological Implications of Agape and Eros.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP S. WATSON, M.A., HEADINGLEY, LEEDS.

In his book *Agape and Eros*¹ Dr. Anders Nygren has made a study of Agape, the Christian idea of love as found in its original purity in the New Testament, and contrasted it with Eros, the Hellenistic idea prevalent in the world which Christianity first entered. Agape is a love which consists in pure self-giving; it is Divine love, welling out of the heart of God and revealed at its deepest in the Cross of Christ. Eros is a love whose motive is pure self-seeking; it is a form of human love, a longing for possession aroused by the desirability of its object. These two ideas of love were originally quite distinct, but they soon inevitably came into contact with one another, and the story of their mutual relationships through the ages largely forms the history of 'the Christian idea of love.' That history has now been written in *Agape and Eros*, Part II.,² of which an English translation is shortly to appear. It is a dramatic record of conflict between Agape and Eros, in which the two ideas appear sometimes in conscious and open hostility, sometimes rest in cool compromise, and in one outstanding instance are united in an uneasy synthesis which in some quarters persists to this day.

Both parts of this work are intended as a scientific study of the Christian idea of love, and no attempt is made to draw out its theological implications. These are not difficult to deduce when the argument is understood—if Part I. has left the reader in doubt, Part II. will go far towards clarifying the issue—yet Dr. Nygren's thesis has been subject to misinterpretations and criticisms which seem strange, not to say perverse, to one who has read most of his writings and enjoyed many unforgettable conversations with him. It is intended in this article, so far as space will allow, to deal with certain major errors of interpretation and to indicate some of the main theological bearings of Agape and Eros, taking as a basis Fr. Hebert's estimate in his Translator's Preface to Part I. and Dr. Leonard Hodgson's criticisms in his Bishop Paddock Lectures.³ Neither of these writers has properly

understood what is meant by either Agape or Eros, and both therefore demand a reconciliation of two ideas which are in fact irreconcilable.

Both Fr. Hebert and Dr. Hodgson give a definition of Eros which is superficially true but fundamentally misleading. Eros is, they say, 'the upward movement of the soul to seek the Divine' (p. vi) or 'the quest of the soul for God' (p. 36).⁴ Now Eros is, in a certain sense, the soul's quest for God; in another sense, it is not a quest for God at all. Eros is fundamentally man's desire and longing for that which will satisfy his needs. He may seek this in the lower, material world of time and sense; but he will not find it there, for things temporal and sensible are imperfect and transient, and in such things the soul can never find complete and permanent satisfaction. The soul belongs by nature to the intelligible, spiritual world, the higher world of eternity, and nothing less will satisfy it. Man's Eros must therefore be set free from earthly entanglements and purified, so that in virtue of its purity the soul may rise out of this world into the eternal, and there find satisfaction in God. The Eros that is directed downwards to the lower world is called 'vulgar Eros'; that which is directed upwards to the higher world is 'heavenly Eros.' We are concerned, of course, with the latter; but it should be noted that the difference between the two lies, not in their essential nature, but rather in the objects to which Eros, man's desire and longing, is directed.

There are two objections in principle to this conception. In Eros man seeks what will satisfy him entirely and permanently, his own *summum bonum*; this he identifies with God; therefore he seeks God. But if he had identified his highest good with something other than God, he would not seek God at all; in the last resort, the quest of Eros is for man's own highest good and not for God. But to attain to God as its highest good, the soul must be pure; therefore in Eros man seeks moral and spiritual purification: that is, he seeks the ethical good; but he seeks this only as a means to an end. Eros is, strictly speaking, both irreligious and immoral. It is immoral because it seeks the good as a means to an end—even though that end be the

¹ *Agape and Eros*, Pt. I, 'A Study of the Christian Idea of Love.' (S.P.C.K., 1932.)

² *Agape and Eros*, Pt. II, 'The History of the Christian Idea of Love.' (S.P.C.K., 1938, 2 vols.)

³ *Grace in Faith and Philosophy* (Longmans, 1936), 35-42.

⁴ The references in brackets are to Fr. Hebert's Preface (Roman figures) and to Dr. Hodgson's book (English figures),

attainment of fellowship with God; and it is irreligious because it seeks fellowship with God as a means to an end—the satisfaction of its own desire. The good ought to be sought for its own sake, because it is good; and God ought to be sought for His own sake, because He is God.

At almost every point, Agape is the antithesis of Eros. It has nothing to do with desire and longing. It does not seek to satisfy its own needs, but to supply the needs of others. 'Agape seeketh not its own.' It does not seek to ascend out of this world to a 'higher world,' but it comes into this world. Whereas Eros is aroused by the real or fancied worth of its object, Agape is 'indifferent to value' and 'uncaused'; that is, Agape is not motivated by anything outside itself; it is a *quellende Liebe*, welling forth spontaneously from its own infinite resources without consideration of the worth or lack of worth in its object. It is revealed at its deepest in the Cross of Christ, where it sacrifices itself utterly for those who have not only no merit, but are actually possessed of the positive demerit of sin. 'God proves His own Agape toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' Not that Agape *prefers* the sinner to the righteous; if it did, it would be a 'caused' love, motivated by the *unworthiness* of its object! The perfection of God's love is displayed in the sending of His sun and rain on both the good (though *not because of* their goodness) and the evil (*in spite of* their sin) alike. And even when it meets with no success, even when rejected and cast out and crucified, Agape does not cease to be love; it is prepared to be a 'lost love,' for even when it finds its labour lost, 'Agape never faileth.'

From the point of view of Agape, Eros is sin; and it is sin in a peculiarly refined and subtle form. It professes to seek the good, and it professes to seek God; yet all the time it 'seeketh only its own.' It is egocentric, and egocentricity—self-seeking and self-centredness of every kind—is irreconcilable with Agape, God's own love, which is from first to last theocentric. It must, however, be strongly emphasized that Dr. Nygren's thesis is dealing with ultimate principles, with the ideas of Agape and Eros in their absolute purity. He does not suggest that no other elements than those of pure Eros ever entered into Hellenistic life and thought; nor that nothing else but pure Agape has ever entered into the Christian tradition—quite the reverse, as Part II. will show.

Dr. Hodgson contends that Dr. Nygren's treatment of his subject is 'artificial' (pp. 37 and 40), on the grounds that he has selected a 'specialized' use

of both Eros and Agape, and that he has 'mis-handled' the New Testament to suit his purpose.

'A certain specialized use of Eros, developed in the Plato-Aristotle-Plotinus tradition, is contrasted with a certain specialized use of Agape which is alleged to be developed in the Synoptic-Pauline-Johannine tradition' (p. 37). Dr. Hodgson objects that 'it is not enough to contrast these two linguistic traditions'; that elements akin to Agape are found outside Christianity; and that 'Dr. Nygren seems not to have realized that our common state is a mixed one, containing elements both of Agape and of Eros' (p. 38, cf. p. 39). These objections, however, are entirely irrelevant. Dr. Nygren is not conducting a piece of linguistic research, and he is fully aware of the facts Dr. Hodgson has mentioned. He is intentionally dealing with a 'specialized use' both of Agape and of Eros, and that with good reason. Despite the differences between them, Agape and Eros have one fundamental thing in common. Both represent a 'heavenly love.' That is to say, both are concerned, each in its own way, with the fundamental question of religion, the question of fellowship with the Eternal, with God. Each claims to be a way of Salvation, a way to fellowship with God. Each forms what Dr. Nygren calls a religious 'fundamental motif'; that is, the constitutive principle of a system of religious life and thought.¹ It is therefore most reasonable to compare and contrast them.

Once this fact is realized, it will prevent us from making other false deductions. It is, for instance, very easy to assume that because Agape is God's love, therefore Eros represents all human love. But it does not; it is a particular form of human love, a highly 'specialized' form. Further, it is false to identify Eros with all 'selfishness,' all forms of human self-seeking and egocentricity. The Neoplatonist is egocentric in his Eros; but the Pharisee is no less egocentric in his attempt to claim a place in the Kingdom of God on the grounds of his own righteousness. Yet Hellenistic Eros religion and the Judaistic religion of the Law are by no means the same thing.

Dr. Hodgson's second main contention is that the New Testament is mishandled (p. 40). He alleges that Dr. Nygren contradicts Synoptic evidence in denying that man can have Agape towards God, and the evidence of Johannine literature when he denies that Agape can be predicated of the eternal inner life of the Blessed Trinity.

In the Great Commandment our Lord says:

¹ For a brief discussion of the term 'motif,' see Translator's Preface to Part II.

'Thou shalt love (*agapeis*) the Lord thy God . . . '—therefore, says Dr. Hodgson, man can have Agape towards God. No doubt; but in what sense? It is not enough to repeat words. Here our Lord is clearly speaking of a relation in which man ought to stand towards God. What is this relation? The rest of our Lord's teaching can scarcely leave us in doubt. 'No man can *douleuein* (be the slave of) two masters; for either he will hate the one, and love (*agapeis*) the other. . . .' (Mt 6²¹). There is the sum of the matter. To love God means: to be at God's disposal as a slave is always at his master's disposal, loyal and obedient, and with no concern but that his master's will should be done; and also, to base one's whole existence upon God, to place absolute trust and confidence in Him, and to leave in His hands the ultimate responsibility for everything.¹ Now if that is what Agape towards God means, then Dr. Nygren has never denied that man can have Agape towards God. What he denies is that man can love God in the same sense in which God loves man. Yet he certainly does not argue that 'God is such that our love for him must always be the quest for satisfaction through possession of One pre-eminently desirable' (p. 36). Such love would be Eros love, which 'seeketh only its own' even in God. It is true that man's love for God is always 'caused,' but the cause is not necessarily the equation of God with man's *summum bonum*. 'We love *because* He first loved us.' But God's Agape is spontaneous and 'uncaused,' not motivated by anything in us; and unless we are to argue that the relation between man and God should be a fellowship of equals, we can hardly maintain that man can have Agape towards God as God has Agape towards man. But that does not mean that we must identify man's love with Eros.

Dr. Hodgson's next objection is that Dr. Nygren 'regards as a weakness of the Johannine theology what is really one of its most valuable contributions to Christian thought. It . . . clearly presents to us Agape as having its home in the eternal divine life. . . .' (p. 41). But what does Dr. Nygren actually say? With reference to the Johannine teaching on Agape, he writes: 'Its positive significance is that it has taken quite seriously the fact that in His very "essence" God is Agape. . . . God is love not only in relation to sinners. God's love is eternal; before the world began, the Father loved the Son.'² He adds that there is a certain danger

in this for the idea of Agape. When the love of the Father for the Son is made the prototype of all Agape, there is a risk of our supposing that the Father loves the Son *because* He is the supremely *worthy* object of love, and forgetting that Agape is spontaneous and 'uncaused.' This danger is illustrated by certain traits in Johannine thought. It is significant that in 'John' love for the brethren has replaced love for the neighbour, and that the thought of love for enemies nowhere occurs. Dr. Hodgson, however, seems to think Dr. Nygren holds: 'since Agape is by definition the spontaneous, uncaused love of what is worthless, it cannot be predicated of the eternal, inner life of the blessed Trinity' (p. 40). But Agape does not love *only* what is worthless! It is 'indifferent to value' in the sense that it can and does love the worthy and the unworthy alike; in neither case is it motivated by the worth or lack of worth in its object. When the Father loves the Son, He does so because He is Agape, not because the Son is a worthy object of love.

Dr. Hodgson is aware of the antithesis between self-seeking Eros and self-giving Agape, yet he desires a reconciliation between them. In the 'ideal life' the conflict between them has disappeared, and the lover 'whole-heartedly gives himself in devotion to an object which entirely satisfies him. He does not pursue it because it will satisfy. . . . Nevertheless, the result is satisfaction' (p. 39). The antithesis exists only because of the evil in this world of space and time; in the eternal life of the Trinity it is transcended (p. 40). But this is a strange 'reconciliation.' In fact, Eros has disappeared and given place to Agape. Eros only loves its object because it thinks it will satisfy; it is Agape that loves so as to give itself without regard to its own satisfaction. Agape is not indifferent to the response with which it meets, of course, and given the due response 'the result is satisfaction' no doubt. Doubtless, too, in the 'ideal life' Agape would always meet with such response. Yet even when Agape meets with nothing but rejection, it still goes on loving—a thing which Eros would not do. From the point of view of Eros, Agape is sheer folly; from the point of view of Agape, Eros is one example of 'the evil in this world of space and time,' for it is a very subtle form of sin. Here is no necessary antithesis, only

original 20, and the sentences here quoted have disappeared. Such reduction of the text is unfortunate, and this is not the only instance of it. Even so, Fr. Hebert cannot be fairly accused of *reversing* his author's meaning.

¹ See Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum neuen Testament*, i, art. 'Agape,' esp. p. 45.

² This is quoted from the Swedish, p. 118. In the English translation a paragraph of 7 lines represents an

to be reconciled in eternity, but a simple logical and practical contradiction which can only be resolved by the disappearance of either Agape or Eros.

Fr. Hebert also desires a reconciliation between Eros and Agape. He has much to say of the incompatibility of the two ideas, and sees that 'there never has been nor can be a final theological synthesis' between them. Yet he insists that 'a practical reconciliation of the two tendencies . . . is a necessity of life' (p. xv). The reason for this seems to be that he has been guilty of a false identification. He says that Eros and Agape 'represent two tendencies which must be united in Christian theology: God is both Creator and Redeemer' (p. vii); and that the distinction between Eros and Agape is that between Nature and Grace (p. viii). Now it is true that God is both Creator and Redeemer, but it is not true that these aspects are represented by Eros and Agape respectively.

First, Eros cannot represent what Christianity means by the dogma of Creation. It was not Hellenism, but the Bible, which taught us that God is Creator. The God of Hellenistic Eros theory is not a Creator; he is entirely inactive; he sets things in motion 'by being loved'; he himself loves only himself and is sufficient for himself. The nearest approach in Hellenistic thought to the idea of Creation is that of emanation; but emanation and Creation are poles apart. Further, Eros theory always regards this world as at least 'inferior' and 'imperfect,' if not in itself evil. Fr. Hebert is anxious to guard against anything like the Marcionite heresy which delivers the world in which we live into the hands of an evil Demiurge, and regards the 'natural world' as evil (cf. p. xiv). But he can scarcely do this by introducing a conception which is bound up with the inferiority of the sense-world and of the soul as a prisoner in the body from which it longs to escape. And it is useless to reply: 'As Creator, God is the author of the natural world and of human life, with its upward movement which Aristotle describes in terms of Eros' (p. xii). God is the author of the natural world and of human life; but it is as reasonable to say that He is the author of sin as to say that He is the author of the 'upward movement' of Eros—for if God is Agape, then Eros is totally contrary to His nature.

Secondly, when Agape is rightly understood, the question of God as Creator and Redeemer presents no difficulty. Fr. Hebert has fallen into Marcion's own error in limiting the significance of Agape to Redemption alone. That is why he feels the danger

of Marcionite conclusions. If we start with Creation and Redemption as two separate ideas we shall have difficulty in uniting them; we shall tend to speak as if there were two Gods, the Creator and the Redeemer, who must somehow be shown to be one. But the Christian Faith knows only one God—the God who has revealed Himself in His 'fullness' in Christ. In Christ we see the essential nature of God, who is both Creator and Redeemer. And what is this nature, this 'fullness,' but Agape? 'God is Agape'; and it is Agape that both creates and redeems. This is of the utmost importance, for if God has really revealed himself at all, then we must interpret His creation in the light of His own revelation of Himself, His nature and purposes. Otherwise we run the grave risk of interpreting 'Nature' by our own light and finding that our interpretation does not agree with what God has revealed. The light that is in us may, after all, be darkness.

'God is Agape.' This is vitally important for our view of the natural world; but it is no less important for our understanding of Agape that God is Creator. Marcion's denial that God is Creator seriously weakens the idea of Agape itself. His God pitied men—who were total 'strangers' to him, and therefore under no obligation to him—because of their misery, caused by the cruel Demiurge-Creator. Our God loves and forgives men—who owe Him everything, yet have rebelled against Him—in spite of their sin.¹ Furthermore, the dogma of Creation is an important bulwark of defence for the Agape motif against Hellenistic Eros piety²; and it also bears a certain positive witness in itself to the idea of Agape. In its traditional form as 'Creation *ex nihilo*' it testifies to the spontaneity, the 'uncaused' or unmotivated nature, of the Divine love.

Finally, a word about the term Agape itself. Dr. Nygren uses it in a 'specialized' sense. It has borne other meanings in the course of history,³ and the reality Dr. Nygren intends it to convey has been signified by other words.⁴ Yet his usage has New Testament legitimation, it is peculiarly Christian, and it denotes the very foundation of our Faith: it is God's own love, the 'love of the Cross,' to which we owe both our 'creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life' and our eternal salvation.

¹ Cf. *Agape and Eros*, Pt. II., vol. I, 109-110.

² Cf. *op cit.*, 61-62 and 71-72.

³ E.g. Gnosticism degraded it to the lowest level of 'vulgar eros'; *op cit.*, 87 ff.

⁴ Cf. e.g., *op. cit.*, 158 n.1.

The Jewish Problem.

By THE REVEREND FREDERIC C. SPURR, HOVE, SUSSEX.

THE 'Eternal Jew,' often hidden in the mists of history, but always emerging from time to time to make the world aware that he is present, has now become a central figure upon which all eyes are focussed. The 'purge' in Germany and Austria, with its unparalleled brutalities and insults, has outraged the conscience of the entire civilized world, save that enclosed portion which claims to have a monopoly of *Kultur*. Before the unprejudiced conscience of humanity the appalling persecution of the Jews, simply because they are Jews, can have no manner of justification. It may be admitted, and indeed it is admitted by Jews themselves, that certain restrictions upon the activities of a certain type of Jew in Germany were perhaps necessary. There were Jews, unquestionably, who exploited Germany, and cared only for their own profits. (But are there no Britons who treat their own country in a similar way? And no Americans?) If proved offenders had been treated hardly, no voice would have been raised against the action. What has aroused the enlightened conscience of the world is the indiscriminate attack upon an entire people on account of their race; people, also, many of whom are more German than Jew by reason of birth and social service. And tragedy becomes farce when the purge is undertaken under the pseudo-scientific claim of a pure blooded Germany which must not on any account be tainted with a Semitic admixture! How even German anthropologists and historians must be laughing up their sleeves! We begin, therefore, by an expression of the deepest sympathy with a harried and outraged community.

The desperate situation calls for immediate emergency measures, and these are now, happily, being considered, both by many States and, naturally, by the Churches.

Beyond the problem raised immediately, however, there lies an ultimate problem, that of the Jew himself *qua* Jew, and his future. The disposal of the *émigrés* from Germany and Austria, however happily achieved, still leaves the main problem to be faced and settled. For it is a world problem with roots going far back to pre-Christian times. It is becoming acute even in the United States, where, nominally, there is no 'race' question at all. And it is not at all, as so many are fond of saying, a problem that has been raised by Jewish contacts with Christianity.

The simple truth is that the Jews have always been disliked from the days of Egypt onwards, and there have been few countries in which their presence has not, sooner or later, been resented. This fact must be taken into account as part of the wider problem, and some answer must be found to the inevitable question, *Why* has this people always been suspected and disliked? There must be some reason for it, other than that of shifting national policies. It is true, alas! that Christendom has, more than once, lent itself to the anti-Christian business of persecuting this race. For such iniquitous work no justification can be offered. Persecution is wholly foreign to the spirit of Him who prayed, 'Father, forgive them, they know not what they do.' Yet there is another side to this story, a side which is frequently overlooked. Very rarely is it recalled that successive Popes entered the most serious protests against the Jew baiting in Spain when the Inquisition was at its height, or that the great Saint Bernard, the most important man in Europe, personally journeyed to Germany to arrest the massacres of Jews. And how many people know that in the Roman Missal the first day of August is set apart for the double commemoration of Saint Peter *ad vincula*, and the Holy Macca-bees, those Jews who, under Antiochus were done to death for their fidelity to the faith of their Fathers? If we are to have history at all, let us have it completely. The story of mediæval times is not quite so black as it is often painted by partisans.

The question before us, however, is that of the Jew *to-day*. Whatever has happened in the past, it is the present and the immediate future which are our concern. The approach must be sympathetic, at least for a Christian, for no Christian can be anti-Semitic. He is bound by his faith to respect all men whatever be their race or creed. Yet, with the sympathy, there is need of the clearest thinking.

We may begin by asking what is the charge against the Jew? What are the alleged grounds for disliking him? They may be summarized under one or two heads.

(1) First, it is alleged that he is *arrogant*. He still believes himself to be the 'chosen' of God, the spiritual superior of others. Judaism is declared to be the purest form of religion. With

this, it is said, there also goes the sense of mental superiority. 'The Jew is destined to rule the world.' Sir George Adam Smith (*Syria and the Holy Land*) tells how he visited a Jewish colony in Palestine. The Jews were gambling, while the *fellaheen* were working for them at a low wage. Sir George remarked, 'This could not be the intention in giving them the Holy Land.' And the reply came at once 'Is it not written that the sons of the alien shall be your ploughmen and vinedressers?' The great influx of Jews into Palestine, followed by the success of Tel Aviv—which eclipses Jerusalem—the establishment of a Hebrew University, and the commercial exploitation of the country, has given the Jew a new sense of superiority, so much that one of them could write: 'The 250,000 Jews are of more value than 800,000 Arabs because of our investments.'

It will be seen, therefore, that there is no religious question here at all. Mr. Sidney Dark, in his valuable book on the Jews—largely favourable to them—says, 'The Jew has a superiority complex,' hence he inclines to be arrogant and discourteous.

(2) There is alleged against him an undue influence in the financial world. 'He is a born gambler.' He loves to control money. Generally, he avoids manual labour, whenever possible, and seeks 'money jobs.' He has been the money lender, *par excellence*, and as the courts have often shown, at exorbitant rates of interest.

(3) A third allegation is that of an undue influence in commerce. The cinema is largely in his hands, as also the clothing, tobacco, furniture, jewellery, and fruit businesses. It is said that many of his business methods are underhand, that he does not trade under his own name, that in Britain he adopts a British name to conceal the fact that he is a Jew.

(4) His methods of killing beasts for food are described as 'inhuman.'

(5) He remains aloof from the community in which he has sought refuge, or into which he has been born. His food and his general habits are not those of the people amongst whom he lives. His day for worship is not that of the majority. He can therefore take advantage of the Christian Sunday to pursue his trade to the detriment of those who have to close their establishments on that day.

These are some of the common charges brought against him. They should be proved or withdrawn. So long as they remain in the popular mind they are a source of irritation. It will be observed that in this summary the religious question does

not appear. The underlying dislike is due to social and economic reasons. As Mr. Sidney Dark frankly says, 'The Jew is responsible for this suspicion. *He is apart by his own act.*'

We may pass on to inquire, *What does the modern Jew say of himself?* Here we are on surer ground since there is no prejudice at work. During the last five or six years a number of books have poured from the press setting out the Jewish case, and expounding the Jewish ideals. With these also have been produced a number of films for the purpose of propaganda. It is significant that several of the books come from the United States, which has the largest Jewry in the world. The city of New York alone has more than two millions of Jews, a greater number than in the whole of Britain. Four of these books may be selected as typical of the remainder.

In 1934, Messrs. Macmillan published *Judaism as a Civilisation*, by Mordecai M. Kaplan, an ex-Rabbi who left the Synagogue on account of his unorthodoxy. He wrote his book with the avowed purpose of reconciling American-Jewish life. For in the United States the growth of the Jewish community, and its influence in the commercial world has raised the very question (with one difference) which has come to a head in Germany. Mr. Kaplan's main question is, 'Why should Jews endure the inconvenience of remaining Jews in Christian countries?' His book is intended to supply the answer. And it is very significant. 'It is *not*,' he says, 'because of religion.' 'The Jew will not be reduced to the status of a religious denomination.' No! the entire question for Mr. Kaplan is a social one and not religious at all. He himself is not an orthodox Jew, yet he demands his right to remain a Jew. 'Heavenly salvation is not his main interest.' 'The Jews are a distinct nation' (*sic*). 'There is a unique Jewish culture.' 'The Jew must in all parts of his life be a Jew.' And he wishes America to accept that: the existence of a separate people who also share the life of America.

A year earlier (1933) Josef Kastein published his *History and Destiny of the Jews*. He also has no place for the religious question. He is frankly rationalistic. Thus: 'It was not God who willed this people and their meaning, but this people who willed this God and the meaning.' . . . Speaking of Palestine he says, 'Palestine was not a gift of God: it was won by war.' The idea of a 'chosen people' vanishes. By the chosen people is meant 'the survival of a people as an *example*.'

... Even more truculent is the sentence, 'Judaism has no mission, and has never sent out missionaries.' He makes some rather remarkable admissions, such as, that the Jews themselves were responsible for Rome crushing them. Still more remarkable: 'Christianity was not responsible for the persecution of the Jews... it was not true Christianity but *political acts*' (p. 229). Other admissions are equally suggestive. The Jews, he says, came to England only after the Norman Conquest, and their motive was 'attraction by the economic possibilities it held out.' Mr. Kastein seems to have no superiority complex. 'We shall not yield to the temptation to claim for Judaism men of outstanding ability merely because they happen to be Jews.' The entire book, indeed, is in effect a surrender of the whole idea of the 'chosen people.' Yet Mr. Kastein reaches the conclusion that the Jew *qua* Jew is 'a people destined to endure.' But for this he advances no reason whatever.

A decade ago (1924) a Jewish apologia, *Essays of Jewish Life and Thought* appeared in this country. In this composite work little or nothing is made of the religious question. The outlook is almost entirely secular. 'The first duty of man is to make the world a tolerable place to live in, and *only when he has done that* will there be time to turn to the world beyond.' As to religion, it is stated that 'Judaism is not a systematized religion. It has no definite dogmas. *It is really an outlook on life.*' ... And yet 'Judaism is the purest form of religion,' and 'the Jews are the yeast of the earth.' Here the superiority complex is in evidence, but not in any way as a deduction from any premises supplied by the authors of the volume.

Laurie Magnus, in *Jews and the Christian Era* (1929), sums up his conclusions in a practical sentence: 'Christianity is in debt to the Jews for the Old Testament,' therefore 'Jews should share lavishly in the fruits of the civilization they helped to sow.' Here the outlook is frankly materialistic: heavy interest for their comparatively small share of the Capital.

To these four typical books of their class may be added a fifth, published in 1937—*The Jew in Revolt*, by William Zukerman, an American journalist. His book has not been favourably received by Jewry. We must allow for a certain hysteria in its pages, and also for certain exaggerations. It is the facts he presents which are so challenging. He has no love for Zionism, which, he considers, is politically minded rather than religiously minded. And he traces

many of the present troubles in Palestine to the speculators in real estate and building, who in 1924-5 forced a financial boom which harmed the country. Economically they formed the most decadent class in Jewry (p. 149). For them business and commerce were to take the place of work on the land. Palestine was to become the business centre of the near East, and was to awaken that part of the world to the glories of Capitalism (p. 151). 'The entire middle-class period in Palestine, 1924-1936, was permeated with the rush and push, grab and keep spirit of this class; its ultimate purpose being *not* to change Jewry and make it fit for a new type of life in Palestine, but to *change Palestine* and make it a suitable refuge for the Jewish middle classes' (p. 152). And so they 'turned Palestine into a restless, predominantly commercial and financial centre with all the artificiality of industrialism in its decay' (p. 153). And he concludes that 'if the present régime continues it will imperil Judaism all over the world.'

Zukerman's book needs reading with caution. The opinions and the facts he adduces must be sharply separated. But it should be read all the same.

These five revealing books tell us a great deal concerning the modern Jew and his relation to the rest of the world. They make it clear that the Jew, as such, has no *exceptional* contribution to make to *religion*, for the reason that he has no special religion; nothing in fact that is not found in Islam, and in a richer form in Christianity. For the orthodox Jew religion does not advance beyond the Old Testament. But the orthodox Jew is in a minority in the advanced countries. American Jewry is, in the main, more divided than are the great Protestant denominations. 'Liberal' Judaism has in effect abandoned Mosaism and much of the Old Testament. Many Jews have become Theosophists, Eddyites, and Spiritualists. It is said that in New York 80,000 Jews have left the Synagogue for the Eddy cult. It would appear, therefore, from modern Jewish writings that there is nothing left in Judaism, on its religious side, that in any way is exceptional.

But what of the cultural claim? It is here that the Jew advances his special rights. There are some great Jewish names in science, literature, and medicine. But Mr. Kastein will not claim these as possessing outstanding ability 'because they happen to be Jews,' but for quite other reasons, such as the milieu in which they are found, and the culture with which others have enriched them.

For the Jew *qua* Jew has created no civiliza-

tion. Greece and Rome bequeathed to the world great memorials, the Jew has bequeathed none. His contributions to literature and science are comparatively rare. 'He comes late into the field which others have sown.' The great names of science are non-Jewish: Watt, Stephenson, Marconi, Pasteur, Edison, Galileo, Newton, Oliver Lodge, Jeans. The great names in literature, art, and philosophy are non-Jewish: Michael Angelo, Dante, Tasso, Descartes, Kant, Shakespeare, Goethe. And also in music: Joachim, the famous violinist himself a Jew, deplored the fact that there had never been a Jewish composer of the first rank. Meyerbeer and Offenbach are not comparable with Palestrina, Bach, Beethoven, Wagner, Mozart, and Elgar.

It would not seem, therefore, that there is any justification for the notion that there resides in Judaism a native superiority which gives it the right to claim exceptional privileges. We may rather sympathize with Isaac Disraeli who left the synagogue because 'it cuts Jews off from the great family of mankind.'

These conclusions, which are drawn from Jewish admissions, certainly do not err on the side of sentiment. If they appear to be drastic, the responsibility for this belongs to those who have practically renounced the specific Jewish claim. In the last analysis, therefore, we are left with the Jew as an individual: an alien, a wanderer, who, having no country of his own, has settled in Christian countries, yet who, as Mr. Sidney Dark says, 'remains apart by *his own act*.' It is this fact which constitutes the Jewish problem. *And the problem can only be solved by the Jew himself.* As a religious person he has the right to his own form of worship, and also the right of protection wherever he settles. To persecute him for his religious convictions is unjust and contemptible. But as a racial person he must make up his mind whether he will remain apart, or assimilate with others. If he insists on remaining racially apart, then he must find a country of his own. He cannot remain a separate nation within another nation. A return to the Ghetto is impossible. There remains Palestine. But that country is not large enough to contain the whole of Jewry. Besides, the majority of Jews do not want to live in Palestine. Zionism is a minority movement. Further, the Jew has no greater right to Palestine than has the Arab, who outnumbers him. Yet he is practically claiming that right which, however, is forbidden by the Mandate. The present clash in Palestine is due entirely to this cause. It is not a question

of Islam *versus* Judaism. It is a question of a new race seeking to dominate an older one.

The alternative to this is for the Jew to renounce all national and racial claims, and to share completely the life of the people amongst whom he has found refuge. In a word, to be absorbed socially. Mr. H. G. Wells in his *Shape of Things to Come* visualized this as the ultimate solution. If the Jew has no exceptional religion to maintain, and no exceptional culture to offer, then why should he continue to remain apart? For him to be absorbed would be no more than has happened to Britain and Germany and other peoples during the centuries. And the experiment is now being tried in the United States which accepts all nationalities, and aims ultimately at creating one nation out of them all.

But the Jew must *share completely* the life of the people amongst which he dwells. He must take his share of all the tasks, pleasant and unpleasant, and cease to specialize in finance and trading. For originally the Jew was neither trader nor financier. He was an agriculturalist. He has developed trade and finance in the course of history, and largely through circumstances. But the conditions to-day are wholly changed and it is neither necessary nor desirable that one race should continue to dominate finance or certain industries. The Jew has no native 'genius' for these things. They are largely accidental to him, and the goodwill and peace of the world depend upon a practical recognition of this fact. If the Jew will abandon his exclusiveness and arrogance and belief in his own superiority and throw himself into the common life of the world, he will solve the entire problem. If he refuses, then friction is bound to continue and develop.

Meanwhile, the Church must find a new way of approach to the Jew, for the question on our side is more than political or social; it is eminently religious. Christian Britain has been very kind to the Jew. It has given him asylum, broken down all barriers to his progress, and offered him many honours. And the best type of Jew is changing his attitude towards Christianity. The ancient hate and acrimoniousness are dying. Jews no longer spit at the mention of the name of Jesus. Mr. John Courmos' book (1938), *Hear, O Israel*, is a remarkable evidence of this. He makes a powerful plea to his co-religionists to recover the Jesus whom, he says, they have misunderstood. He even admits the supremacy of Jesus. 'To me the Jewish Bible without Jesus is as unthinkable as it would be without Moses. . . . Moses inevitably led to Jesus.'

The whole book is keyed to this note. Yet Mr. Cournos wants a purely Jewish Christ. And he would get rid of S. Paul and all Christian theology. It is the Jesus of history, with his temporal limitations that he desires. 'Jews to remain Jews must take up their culture *where they left off* nineteen centuries ago.' It is a remarkable admission, but it is retrograde for all that. Still, that a Jew who believes that his race is still the 'chosen people,' should go so far as he has done, is highly significant. There is a new openness of mind, and a movement in the Unitarian direction which hold much promise. And on the Christian side the modern attitude

towards Old Testament prophecy offers a new approach through the medium of the ancient writings. Christianity can only win over the best kind of Jew, as Christians show in their lives that their faith is dynamically superior to any other, and that Christianity is not the destruction of the core of the Jewish faith, but its natural and Divine fulfilment. The older methods of Jewish evangelization are no longer possible, but the double change in the higher Jewish outlook, and in the better Christian understanding of progressive revelation, give us a new basis for trying to solve the age-long riddle of the Jew.

Literature.

A FINE COMMENTARY ON FIRST CORINTHIANS.

AN outstanding work of the moment is Dr. James Moffatt's Commentary on the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* in the Moffatt New Testament Commentary (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net). It is not only an invaluable aid to the study of the Epistle, but is also at the same time a work of considerable theological importance as an exposition of St. Paul's thought. The apt illustrations from ancient and modern writers which we have learnt to expect in Dr. Moffatt's writings reappear in this volume, together with illuminating extracts from missionary literature. The book can also be read as a devotional manual, and a preacher who knows his way will find it full of attractive suggestions.

The Introduction is brief but it adequately covers the important points. Dr. Moffatt explains when and why the Epistle was written, and gives a vivid picture of Corinth and of the conditions which obtained in the Corinthian Church. He also discusses the question of the unity of the Epistle, and adds an interesting section on its significance as a Christian writing. On the whole, his judgment is in favour of accepting the Epistle as a literary whole. He is well alive to the possibility that 6¹²⁻²⁰ 7¹⁷⁻²⁴ 10¹⁻²³ and 11²⁻³⁴ may originally have belonged to the 'first' letter to the Corinthians (cf. 1 Co 5⁹), along with 2 Co 6^{14-7¹}, but his opinion is that the reconstructions ably advocated by Johannes Weiss and M. Goguel 'are not quite convincing.'

Interesting and important as such discussions are,

the most valuable part of Dr. Moffatt's work lies in the Commentary proper. To this task he brings wide knowledge, sound critical judgment, and deep religious insight. We have marked many passages which deserve repeated study, especially those concerned with such topics as St. Paul's use of 'Body' and 'the Body,' the Last Supper and the Lord's Supper, Speaking with Tongues, and 'Maranatha.' Many *obiter dicta* challenge attention, as, for example, Dr. Moffatt's claim that St. Paul was not disillusioned by his Athenian experience, his contention that the 'ransom-passage' in Mk 10⁴⁵ is 'one of the most self-authenticating in the record,' and his submission that an incidental remark like that in 7¹⁰ 'tells against the notion that gifted men in the primitive communities felt inspired to produce, by a free use of their devout imagination, sayings of the Lord to suit the requirements of the cult' (p. 80). We are particularly impressed by his careful study of the meaning of important Greek words in the Epistle, notably in the noble hymn to Love in ch. 13, and by his admirable exegesis of such passages as 7^{10f.} 34. 36-8 10^{10f.} 11^{16.} 23-34 13^{3.} 12f. 15^{24.} 29. 51 16^{22.} Here and there he does not carry us with him, as, for example, in his treatment of 4⁶ and in his suggestion that the Galatian contribution to the Apostolic Collection appears to have been independently transmitted to Jerusalem (p. 272; cf. Ac 20⁴: 'Gaius of Derbe and Timothy'). These, however, are small points where students differ and will continue to differ. It is safe to say that henceforward no one will dream of making a careful study of 1 Co without taking into constant consideration Dr.

Moffatt's Commentary. A more signal mark of his achievement is that he has written a book which is so simply and directly expressed that the general reader, as well as the professed student, will be able to read it with profit and delight.

THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF RELIGION.

In 1925 Dr. G. van der Leeuw, Professor of the History of Religions in the University of Groningen, published an 'Introduction to the Phenomenology of Religion.' In 1933 he followed it up with a larger book bearing the title in the German original of 'Phänomenologie der Religion.' This latter work is now before us in an English translation—*Religion in Essence and Manifestation* (Allen and Unwin; 25s. net). The translator, Mr. J. E. Turner, M.A., Ph.D., Reader in Philosophy in the University of Liverpool, has himself published several notable constructive works in the sphere of theistic thought, and has now laid us under a great debt by his patient and effective rendering of van der Leeuw's seven hundred page work.

The work before us has been compared by the translator to William James's 'Varieties of Religious Experience,' and the comparison is not unjust; but van der Leeuw, whose work is much larger than William James's, deals more elaborately with social anthropology and primitive religion (in which he is an acknowledged master), and lays more emphasis than does William James on the historical as distinguished from the psychological, on 'manifestation' as distinguished from 'essence.'

The work under review is divided into five unequal parts, the largest of which are the first and the third. Part I. treats of the Object of Religion (which is, from the author's standpoint, the subject in the sense of 'the active and primary Agent in the situation'). Here vast learning is brought to the presentation of that field of early belief and custom with which writers like Tylor, Robertson Smith, Sir James G. Frazer, and Dr. R. R. Marett have familiarized English readers. Our author is not, however, so much concerned to uphold theory as to set forth fact.

Part II. turns to the Subject of Religion, and treats of the sacred man, the sacred community, and the soul (the sacred within man). While Phenomenology describes how man conducts himself in relation to Power, it must not be forgotten that man himself first decides, or alters, his attitude after he has been affected by Power, which is 'the active and primary Agent.' 'In this all believers are unanimous, from primitive man who experi-

ences the nearness of Power and calls out "Tabu!" to the apostle who exhorts us to love God because He "first loved us."'

Part III. deals with Object and Subject in their Reciprocal Operation, which takes the forms of outward action (sacrifice, sacrament, festival, myth, prayer, praise, etc.) and inward action (religious experience in all its various phases). To glance only at the chapter on Mysticism is to gain an immediate impression of the comprehensiveness and concreteness of van der Leeuw's method of treatment. Here, as throughout the work, Christianity receives an illuminating setting in the history and psychology of religion.

Part IV. treats of the World, the ways to it of domination and obedience, and the goals of it, man, the world itself, and God. Part V. treats of Forms, whether religions or founders. Here there is an interesting and elaborate classification of religions, which owes its impulse to Hegel's famous classification according to historic types. Christianity is here regarded as the central form of historical religions, and its typology as needing only one word, Love. 'This is because, in Christianity, God's activity and the reciprocal activity of man are essentially the same: the movement of Power towards the world is love, while that of the world towards God is reciprocal love; no other word is available.'

When in his treatment of founders our author passes from the founder, the reformer, the teacher, the philosopher, the theologian, and the example, to reach at length the mediator, he indicates that he has come to the borderland of Phenomenology. The phenomenologist cannot perceive where and how the mediator enters history. 'At this point the contemplative and comprehending servant of research reverently withdraws; his own utterance yields place to that of proclamation, his service to that in the sanctuary.'

'WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?'

Under this title we propose to direct attention to a group of recent publications which deal with various aspects of the world-situation. They have this in common that all are well-informed, and all are challenging. The most deliberately provocative is *The Christian Challenge to Christians*, by Mr. Kenneth Ingram (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). It is a sequel to the author's 'Christianity—Right or Left.' Mr. Ingram writes with clarity and force. One may here and there detect a slight exaggeration, but is there not a kind of prophetic licence to

exaggerate? His view is that Fascism is the last desperate effort of Capitalism to survive, and his condemnation of Capitalism with its product of chronic unemployment is very thorough. He is equally convinced that only on a Christian basis and with Christian principles can a better and permanent civilisation be reared; and a good portion of the book is an 'apologetic' for Christian Faith which, although slight and sometimes too facile will, we hope, make an impression on the church-less class which it is Mr. Ingram's aim to reach.

Next we commend very cordially a book, *Cross and Swastika*, by Dr. Arthur Frey, with Introduction by Karl Barth (S.C.M.; 6s. net). The translation has been very ably done by J. Strathearn M'Nab. Here we get an authoritative and strictly objective account of the struggle of the German Evangelical Church against a Government suppression which aims in Barth's words 'to make the Church powerless, defenceless, even speechless.' The book shows, unhappily, that we must dismiss from our minds any pleasing illusions that in Germany the worst is past for the Church. Yet the book is not one meant to depress. The author's conviction is everywhere plain that the Church, an anvil which has worn out many hammers in the past, will wear out this one also.

Similar is the faith of the Rev. James Barr, B.D., M.P., who has compiled a pamphlet, *Religious Liberty in the Totalitarian States*, with the sub-title 'The Challenge to the Church of Communism, Fascism, Nazism' (Allenson; 6d. net). It is a useful collection of authoritative statements, and is written with the author's characteristic vigour. It is not quite clear why a chapter vindicating John Wesley against a charge of delaying social reform should be included, but it has its own interest.

Then we have a work by Sir Norman Angell, *Peace with the Dictators?* (Hamish Hamilton; 7s. 6d. net). Sir Norman's books require no 'boost'; long ago his name became sufficient guarantee of a book's value. Unlike the other works here mentioned, this one has no direct reference to religion. The problems of our time are discussed just as political problems. Sir Norman has his own very definite views, but few writers can exhibit such understanding of the other side. This is proved afresh in this volume, which opens with a one-man symposium in which Sir Norman sets forth with understanding the positions of a Fascist and a Nazi, and answers as a typical Englishman. Then we have a brief but penetrating criticism

of Pacifism. Then a detailed examination of the situation which confronts British statesmanship, a criticism of its failures, and a forecast of the results of various alternatives. The way of safety, he holds, is that Britain must show that 'the purpose of her power is not monopolisation, but a widening of economic opportunity' for others as well as herself. Nations which value freedom must combine to make a single unit of their power not 'to maintain a situation which crystallizes inequality of right; it must offer to those against whom it arms the same rights of independence, freedom, peace, economic opportunity, which it is formed to defend.'

ZOROASTRIAN RELIGION.

This little book, *The Religion of the Good Life: Zoroastrianism*, by R. P. Masani, M.A. (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), to which the Principal of the Wilson College, Bombay, contributes a Foreword, is welcome as drawing attention to one of the most interesting and least known of the non-Christian religions. Among all the great, living religions Zoroastrianism has the smallest following, but few as the Parsis are they have qualities that may well arouse interest in the religion that has helped to make them what they are. If any one desires to satisfy that interest we can agree with Dr. M'Kenzie when he says that 'for those who are not specialists but who wish to know more regarding Parsi ways of life and thought, this is certainly the book.'

The distinctive characteristic of the faith here expounded is suggested by its description as 'the Religion of the Good Life.' 'Resist evil,' Mr. Masani tells us, 'is the Zoroastrian battle-cry.' This is a well-grounded claim and marks off this religion from its great neighbour, Hinduism, one with it in its origin and yet ultimately so radically diverse from it. Along with this high quality goes, in Mr. Masani's view, what he calls 'the uncompromising monotheistic character of the creed as preached by the sage of Iran.' This some would hesitate to accept as true of this religion, and Mr. Masani himself admits that in later times Zoroastrianism became a dualism. But as his words just quoted indicate, it is the religion of the Gathas that here and throughout most of his book Mr. Masani is expounding. He is well aware that that ancient faith has become sadly corrupted. When J. H. Moulton visited India twenty years ago he gave himself with eager enthusiasm to the task of recalling the Parsis to the teaching of their own great prophet, for, he said, 'the better a Parsi under-

stands Zoroaster's doctrine and the more faithfully he strives to order his life according to his ideals, the nearer he comes to Christ and to the God and Father of us all.' Mr. Masani's book may well have the same effect.

The reading of this book suggests a question. Dr. H. Kraemer, in his recent notable exposition of 'The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World,' divides the religions of the world into two classes, 'prophetic religions of revelation' and 'naturalistic religions of trans-empirical realization.' The former are Christianity, Judaism, and Islam, and the latter all the others. Where does Zoroastrianism belong? It has no historical affinity with the three of the former class, but arises in a wholly alien environment. Was it not, nevertheless, a prophetic religion of revelation? J. H. Moulton and Archbishop Söderblom would say that it was.

CODEX SINAITICUS.

In studying the great ancient copies of the Bible we feel that every detail is important. Probably the greatest and most careful of all authorities on this subject was Tischendorf, and the famous Codex Sinaiticus, which he himself discovered, was to him the most valuable document in the world. He gave it more thorough and careful attention than he bestowed on any other MS., and numbers of other scholars since his time have checked and revised his observations. Yet there is still more to be said, and the British Museum experts have been able to subject it to a fresh examination, using means (such as ultra-violet light in photography) which were not at Tischendorf's disposal. They have recorded the results of their investigations in a sumptuous volume, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus*, by Mr. H. J. M. Milne and Mr. T. C. Skeat, including contributions by Mr. Douglas Cockerell (British Museum; 32s. 6d.), which shows that it was well worth while for this country to procure the MS. They have dealt with such matters as the original size of the MS., the extent of the lost portions, the identity of the various scribes who worked on it, the method of its production—visual copying or dictation—and its date and place of origin. Naturally they have not been able to produce any startling new hypothesis on any of these points, but it is valuable to have the accepted views confirmed and corrected in detail. Sometimes valuable new light has been thrown on certain problems. For instance, it has always been recognized that when the MS. was first written it did not include the last verse of the Gospel according

to St. John. Evidently the original colophon had been erased, and the missing words added over it later. It is now clear that this was the work of the original scribe of this portion, who himself corrected what he believed to have been his mistake. The relations between the Codex Sinaiticus and two other great MSS., Vaticanus and Alexandrinus, are also discussed, and appendices give useful information regarding them. There is an interesting account of the rebinding of the MS. by the Museum experts, and the volume contains over twenty figures and more than forty plates. The former are, for the most part, photographs of parts of the text illustrating the points discussed; the latter are facsimiles of colophons in the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Alexandrinus. The whole work has been beautifully produced, and forms a volume worthy of its subject.

THE PSALMS CHRONOLOGICALLY TREATED.

The exposition of the Psalms is probably the most difficult task which faces the Old Testament scholar; it is a deplorable fact that there is in English no satisfactory modern work on the Psalter. The newest work on the subject is a volume by the American scholar, Moses Bittenwieser—*The Psalms Chronologically Treated* (Cambridge University Press; 22s. 6d. net)—well known for his studies in the prophets and other parts of the Bible. He brings to his task a deep interest in the subject and a wide range of knowledge, though he has hardly been affected by recent European studies. The work of Kittel, Gunkel, and Hans Schmidt has had little influence on him, and we look in vain for any serious appreciation of the established principles of Hebrew poetic form. Even parallelism, which can be so effectively employed in exegesis, is practically ignored. The author has not shaken himself free from the method of treatment, whose best exponent was Ewald, which sought to assign more or less definite dates to individual Psalms. In any case, such an attempt must be largely subjective, and few readers, if any, will follow Bittenwieser when he uses his conjectures as an assured basis for the reconstruction of history, especially of the periods in the post-exilic age of which we know very little. The position becomes more precarious still when we observe the wholesale re-organization of some Psalms, and the arbitrary dissection and synthesis which have made his conclusions possible. It may be freely admitted that most of the Psalms have been considerably modified in the course of their

history, succeeding generations adapting them to their peculiar needs, but changes made for this purpose would hardly have been those which Büttenwieser constantly assumes, and the attempt to recover the original forms by purely subjective methods must always be precarious. An extreme illustration meets us at the very beginning of the book. The author is struck by resemblances between parts of Ps 68 and the Song of Deborah. He therefore reconstructs a Psalm—'68B'—and ascribes it to the poet of Jg 5. The Psalm thus recovered consists of the following verses: 8, 9a-b, 9b, 9a, 16-18, 12-13, 14b, 15, 19a-b, 25-28, 14a. There will, also, be strong divergences of opinion on the literary merit of different Psalms; not many readers would assent to the description of Ps 103 as the work of a 'minor poet,' an 'inferior writer,' who is guilty of 'slipshod imitation of other writers, in the manner characteristic of a plagiarist,' even though it is clear that he made use of the work of other poets. At times we even suspect the writer of failing to appreciate some of the finer points of Hebrew grammar, though there is a very sound and valuable Excursus in the Introduction which deals with the Precative Perfect. Büttenwieser here has called attention to an important point which, as he says, is too often overlooked, in spite of the familiar parallel idiom in Arabic.

EDWYN CLEMENT HOSKYNs.

A volume of sermons delivered in the chapel of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, by the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, Bart., M.C., D.D., has been published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge under the title *Cambridge Sermons* (6s. net). The sermons are preceded by a biographical sketch from the hands of 'Charles Smyth,' but, as his name is not on the title-page, we are not informed about his identity. We gather that he was a disciple and friend of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, and in any case, the biography is both intimate and interesting. No one who remembers the shock of pleasure and enlightenment he received from 'The Riddle of the New Testament,' Hoskyns' best known work, will be disposed to deny him a large and influential place in the development of New Testament scholarship. And we can sympathize with the strain of eulogy that pervades this friendly tribute. It is in this sympathetic spirit that we read the first sentence in it: 'For many of my generation . . . the two outstanding names in the history of Christian thought in England in the present century are those of G. K. Chesterton and

Sir Edwyn Hoskyns'; and this sentence later on, 'His essay on "The Christ of the Synoptic Gospels" in *Essays Catholic and Critical* may be said to have marked, chronologically, the turning of the tide in the study of New Testament Theology in England'; and, finally, 'it may be said of him that no man has done more to familiarize the Church of England with the vitally important developments in Biblical theology in Germany in recent times.'

These are large claims, and they may at any rate be accepted as reflecting the estimate of Hoskyns which prevailed in Cambridge circles. And it is certain that he was a considerable figure in contemporary theology. The sermons included in this volume are divided into five series, the two most important being the first on 'Eschatology' and the second on 'Sin.' Both series are marked by the same qualities—competent scholarship, spiritual earnestness, and decided convictions. They are definitely university sermons, addressed to students, for the most part essays rather than sermons. But they are by no means dry or merely 'scholarly.' The deep religious motive in the preacher informs them all. We can trace the two master forces that helped to mould the preacher's thinking, that of Schweitzer and that of Barth. Hoskyns had a good deal of the former's devout simplicity, and not a little of the latter's dogmatic fervour. But he was not dominated by either. The secret of his life was his own definite faith, and his masters only helped to give it direction.

We can cordially commend a book by an American writer, Mr. Albert Edward Day—*God in us: We in God* (Abingdon Press; \$1.75). It consists of five chapters: The God of Experience, The Experience of God, The Jesus of Experience, The Experience of Jesus, and Religious Experience—An Appraisal, and they are all good. The main point of the book seems to be that people have a very real experience of God if they will only recognize it. In the first chapter the writer exhibits the different ways in which God makes Himself known. We have seldom seen this better done. Mr. Day is not an obscurantist. He knows what can be said against the religious point of view, and states it. But his own faith is clear and well grounded. And his book will give real help to any who wish to know what can be said in reply to the criticisms of current scepticism.

In *The Savage and His Totem*, by Mr. P. Hadfield, M.A. (Allenson; 5s. net), we have a well-documented

account of Totemism and of its distribution. Dr. Denney said of Frazer's 'Golden Bough' that it nearly killed him, and one would welcome any less bewildering road to a knowledge of the vast subject of primitive practices and their significance. Such a handbook as this may be of some help. One does not expect in a compendium graces of style and certainly one does not get them here. On the first page we find this sentence, 'What we call Totemism might be described as a distinct species of animal, plant, or inanimate object to which a group of people pay reverence.' This might be better expressed.

The Rev. J. Warren, B.D. (Dublin), discusses in a pamphlet issued by Messrs. James Clarke & Co., the subject of *Our Alleged Debt to Rome for the Bible*. The pamphlet is reprinted from 'The Evangelical Quarterly' for the Scottish Reformation Society. The tenor of the discussion, which is learned and vigorous, may be gathered from the concluding sentence: 'Had not God in mercy sent us the Reformation, and enabled the Reformers to strive and suffer, would He have had a people of His, gratefully and adoringly holding His blessed Book in their hands, to-day?'

That Roger Bacon was a noteworthy man in his day most people are aware, but few know the real facts about either the man or his work. For that they have scarcely been to blame. Now, however, Mr. F. Winthrop Woodruff has given us all a chance to learn. His *Roger Bacon* (James Clarke; 5s. net) sets forth in very readable form all that is known of this thinker who, we may say, just missed the scientific path, but pointed the way towards it.

The recently founded University of London Institute of Archaeology, under the Directorship of Dr. R. E. M. Wheeler, and the Secretaryship of Miss Kathleen Kenyon, M.A., has issued its *First Annual Report, 1937*, consisting of seventy-two pages. The Annual Reports are intended to contain a résumé of developments and work done during the preceding year, and to give from time to time summaries of lectures of outstanding general interest. They will not contain accounts of research work, as these will be published in the form of special papers or monographs. The present Report gives an interesting account of the opening of the Institute by the Earl of Athlone, K.G., Chancellor of the University, a description of the Headquarters' building (formerly St. John's Lodge), a report of the routine work for 1937, a detailed

statement of the study-collections (which include those of Sir Flinders Petrie), a report on the department of Geochronology, and an important public lecture by C. F. C. Hawkes, F.S.A., on current British Archaeology. Altogether this First Report is a praiseworthy one. The Institute is really a laboratory of archaeological science, wherein the archaeologist of the future may learn the essentials of his business, and as its scope includes the Near East as well as Britain it should prove of interest to Biblical students who desire materials for study, instruction in the treatment of antiquities, and training in archaeological method. The Report is published by the Institute, which is located at Inner Circle, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.

The White Lectures, delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral on the Wednesdays in Lent, were this year all concerned with the Bible. The Lecturers included Dean Inge, the Rev. Anthony C. Deane, and Dr. W. R. Matthews. Dean Inge's subject was 'What England owes to the Bible'; Dr. Matthew's subject was 'The Bible and the Living Word of God.' It will easily be imagined that in such hands these subjects were adequately dealt with. It is extraordinary how fresh men, with such furnished minds, can be on topics so often written on. *Our English Bible* is the title of the booklet which contains the six lectures. The publishers are Longmans, and the price is 2s. 6d. net.

A volume of interesting and suggestive essays on aspects of religion and life has been published by Messrs. Maclehoose & Co., *The Courage to be Real*, by the Rev. Geoffrey Allen (5s. net). Mr. Allen's name is associated with a well-known book, 'Tell John,' and in his new work he has given us something in its own way quite as stimulating. The Essays are disconnected so far as their subjects are concerned 'Grace and Truth,' 'The Kingdom,' 'Growth,' 'Fear,' 'The Love of Money,' 'The Crowd,' 'Evangelism,' 'Missions,' and 'God,' are the titles. But there is an underlying continuity because of the way in which the writer thinks of everything. The main message of the book is that everything is of grace, and that grace produces truth, reality, and the courage to be real. Mr. Allen makes skilful use of the conclusions of modern psychology, and he acknowledges a modified debt to the Oxford Group. But he is essentially independent, and, while deeply rooted in the essentials of the gospel, he maintains a broad, human outlook on life and truth. These essays will repay careful consideration.

One of the most striking of modern contributions to the study of the Old Testament is Professor S. H. Hooke's theory of a 'ritual pattern,' characteristic of almost all forms of religion in the ancient Near East. The main outlines were sketched in his contributions to 'Myth and Ritual' and elsewhere, and he has now developed the theme still further in his Schweich Lectures, *The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual* (Milford; 6s. net). The first of the three is devoted to an account of early Mesopotamian ritual, with special stress on the death and the marriage of the god. The second lecture is given up to a discussion of Canaanite ritual, for which our two main sources of information are the Ras Shamra documents and the Old Testament. The third gathers together the material and applies it to a study of Israelite cults. While Professor Hooke has propounded no fresh theory, he has shown even more clearly than before the basis on which his views rest, and has given us a straightforward statement of a position which it will not be easy to refute. A number of plates add to the interest of a book which will take a significant place in Old Testament studies.

The Episcopal Church in the United States has a 'Forward Movement' on hand, and the Bishop of Southern Ohio, Chairman of the Movement's Commission, has preached a sermon on it which is published as the 'Hale Memorial' sermon, *The Forward Movement in the Episcopal Church* (Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois). The burden of the sermon is that we shall go forward spiritually mainly by the faithful use of the means of grace in our possession. This is urged with earnestness and ability.

A beautiful little book, intended for those who have just been confirmed, is compiled by the Rev. D. E. W. Harrison, M.A., and the Rev. S. F. Allison, M.A.—*The Christian Life* (S.P.C.K.; 1s. and 1s. 6d. net). It is divided into three parts; first, the meaning of the Christian faith and its implications for life; second, the aids to Christian living (Prayer, Bible Reading, and Holy Communion); and third, the Communion Service, with suggestions for the communicant's use. This is an admirable book to put into the hands of one who has just taken on himself the responsibilities of full Church membership. It contains real help where help is most needed.

In his recent volume, *Did Christ Really Live?*

(S.C.M.; 5s. net), Dr. H. G. Wood discusses what is now for students of theology an old and familiar question, but a question which may still be a source of trouble to some minds. The task he sets before him is to examine by the standards of historical enquiry the case presented by those who deny the historicity of Jesus. He asks first how they account for the rise of Christianity when they have set the historical Jesus aside. In this connection he considers two propositions put forward as fundamental by J. M. Robertson in his 'Pagan Christs.' One is that the Gospel story of the Last Supper, the Agony, the Betrayal, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection is originally a mystery-drama; the other, that the mystery-drama was an evolution from a Palestinian rite of human sacrifice, and was associated with an ancient pre-Christian cult of a hero-god called Jesus or Joshua. It is the merit of Dr. Wood's book that he examines and refutes these two propositions in detail, incidentally showing his own close acquaintance with the relevant literature; but, despite his attempt to blunt the edge of this criticism, we cannot help feeling that a later work in this field of the Christ-Myth theory might well have been selected for discussion than one written so far back as 1903. Dr. Wood concludes his book by considering the questions: What is the religious significance of the historicity of Jesus? And what do we know about the historic Christ? He contends that a historical Jesus is a richer and fuller revelation of love than a myth, however beautiful; and that, try as we may, we cannot get Jesus out of history.

Prayer and the Social Revolution, by John S. Hoyland (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), is written from the standpoint of one who has been driven by his experience in the distressed areas to a definite socialist standpoint. But the author is not a materialist, nor does he share the extreme Marxist view of history. He is an ardent Christian and as ardent a believer in prayer. One great advantage in the present-day swinging of the world towards dictatorships, he says, is that we know by name for whom we should pray. And prayer is needed not so much for peoples or legislatures but concentrated on a few statesmen who control policies. It is a cry for the altering of the spirit of these men. Mr. Hoyland longs for the social revolution that will bring justice to the dispossessed. But he looks for this to prayer that puts our wills at the disposal of the Will of God. After stating his position he follows with a detailed exposition of the Lord's Prayer. This is a fine book, intellectually and

spiritually. Whatever your economic opinions may be, you will find here real enlightenment.

The Joint-Committee of Anglican and Free-Churchmen which has been conducting 'Conversations' about Church union for some years issued lately an 'Outline of a Reunion Scheme,' and the Rev. Hugh Martin has, by request of the Committee, written a brief commentary on it. His purpose is to explain the scheme, to emphasize its most important features, to point out the issues of greatest difficulty and to suggest how these can be met. He has gone over the scheme point by point, and, with a remarkable breadth of mind and a clear grasp of essentials, he commends the scheme to the consideration of the members of the churches. This little pamphlet, *Can We Unite?* (S.C.M.; 6d.) should be read and carefully considered by all interested in such a notable adventure. And who is not?

Fascism in the English Church, by a London Journalist (Henry E. Walter, London; 2s. 6d. net), is an 'exposure' of the errors to which the writer thinks the Church of England is giving itself up. Romanism and Rationalism are destroying the Church, which is being dominated by a dictatorship of the clergy. The 'Low' Church is being snuffed out. Very few of its ministers are asked to broadcast, or to serve on commissions. Romish practices are being foisted on congregations. What is wanted,

the journalist thinks, is propaganda by the people who object to all this. The writer is very much in earnest, and he gives his alarms an up-to-date form by deft journalistic touches.

The volume of essays recently published in memory of Linda R. Miller contains an article by Professor Solomon Zeitlin on *The Pharisees and the Gospels*, which is available in separate form. The problem of the relations between Pharisaism and the Early Church is still far from being solved. On the one hand, we have the undeniable fact that the two had a great deal in common, and on the other the equally undeniable fact that the Pharisees of Jesus' day were bitterly hostile to Him. Professor Zeitlin's contribution to the study of the question is to take the teaching of Jesus, especially from the Sermon on the Mount, and show that it was concerned with the practical ethic of the individual, while the Pharisaic pronouncements as seen in the Mishnah and other parts of the Talmud dealt with the administration of public law. The charge of hypocrisy brought against the Pharisees by Jesus (according to the Biblical text) he explains as a later insertion in the Gospels, pointing to the use of the term Rabbi as another illustration of the tendency to insert later words and phrases into the story. Even if the main contention of the essay does not meet with general approval, it contains interesting exegeses of some New Testament passages, and its sympathetic tone is very welcome.

James Denney.¹

BY PRINCIPAL EMERITUS W. M. MACGREGOR, D.D., TRINITY COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

TO-DAY we are filling a blank in the visible records of our College. During its eighty-two years it has enjoyed the services of many teachers, whose renown has been much more than provincial—Lindsay, Bruce, Drummond, Smith, Orr, Denney; and it is right that somewhere on our walls their names should be inscribed. 'Let us now praise famous men and our fathers who begat us. . . . Their bodies lie buried in peace, but their wisdom still is declared, and the Church sounds forth their praise.'

¹ Address at the unveiling of a Memorial in Trinity College, Glasgow, 18th May, 1938, to Principal James Denney.

When I came up here in October 1881 Denney was entering on his third year in Divinity. He was then a shy, austere, rather formidable figure, a little older than many of us, and by no means easy of approach. In the Theological Society, where others splashed in the shallows, theorizing and talking at large, he was able to push out into deep waters as one who knew his way. He had been by far the most distinguished student of his time in the University, and to us he appeared as already a master in Classics and Philosophy, in Literature and the history of opinion within the Church. He had the most admirable gift of pregnant and witty and

often demolishing utterance. And to this rich intellectual equipment he added an overawing sense of the religious realities in their dogmatic form. Students then were much as they are to-day, and it is not surprising that in choosing a President for the Society we preferred someone nearer our own level. He was not arrogant but he was a little remote, and he was terribly impatient of words without knowledge. Thus, although he had a circle of devoted friends, the majority of us would have declared of him what Emerson said of Thoreau: 'I would no more think of taking his arm than of taking the arm of an elm-tree.' But in supplement or modification of this, I may mention a trivial incident of some years later when, for the first time, he appeared as candidate for a vacant congregation. He was one of a leet of five for the old Free Church in Troon, and an elder there afterwards told me that each of the other competitors, forgetting his own interests and ambitions, had independently advised the Troon people to choose Denney. For this was a man by himself.

Those who knew him later will recognize in this impression of student days features and characteristics of their friend—the touch of shyness and austerity, which made others shy until they came to know him, the passionate depth of religious feeling in its Pauline form, and the amazing ease and fullness of mind which enabled him throughout his life unflinchingly to answer every call. When he left his charge in Broughty Ferry he burned his sermons, and to the end he declared that he would not scorch a finger in rescuing his manuscripts from a conflagration; and why should he, when he always had himself to draw upon? His *Letters*, though written in days of overwhelming occupation, are unlaboured and delightful, full of ideas, full of wit, with stories of children interspersed; and his talk had the same enviable quality. Disraeli once said that famous wits were often the dulllest of companions, because they incline to hoard up their good things for some more important occasion; but, as Denney once observed, 'it is the things a man says without thinking which have the sap of nature in them.' Certainly his good things did not come from his memory, but freshly from himself, and they were often astonishingly good. When Lord Haldane had delivered a lecture of notable energy and quite as notable obscurity in New College, Edinburgh, one of us asked Denney if he had always seen where the lecturer was going: 'No, but he was going as fast as he could.' After listening to a paper on Maeterlinck, he muttered: 'It is bad enough to be at sea, but to be at sea in a fog!'

This last example suggests another persistent characteristic of his mind—his almost fanatical love of clearness. His intellect in all its operations had a keen, cutting edge; in confessing that he never used illustrations in preaching he adds that what is needed is not illustration but lucidity, and this he always attained. He stoutly affirms that 'a poet is a man who can say what he wants to say; if he cannot say it he is not a poet, no matter how much he may stimulate critics to guess what was in his mind and say it for him.' Dr. Moffatt justly remarks on the strong hold which the eighteenth century had upon him—that age when even 'philosophy bent itself to be lucid and practical.' This appears very much in his style, which allowed him always to say great things in the most concise and simple way, and it made him bemoan the weakness of his students, not one man in a score of whom could 'say what he means, or put his mind plainly down on paper.' It also affected his attitude to practical affairs, making him impatient of those who juggled with abstract nouns: 'There is nothing that tends more to intellectual degeneration,' he said, 'than to play with words like establishment and disestablishment, and imagine that in doing so we are dealing with anything.' This eighteenth-century lucidity helped him vastly as an expositor, impelling him to clear away the litter of scholastic irrelevance of which so many commentaries are full. 'The worst of being erudite,' he asserts, 'is that a man forgets how many things are better forgotten.'

In his own use of Scripture the two sides of his nature—the scholastic and the humanist—are sometimes in conflict. In his earliest book he says as a humanist that 'the Apostles were not people speaking with the servile precision of modern science, but with what Plato calls a gentlemanly freedom in the use of words.' So when Paul's words favour the idea of a mystical union (which Denney disliked), he boldly explains the phrase as 'the language of passion, with an emotional and poetic truth, not to be translated into prose.' But where Paul's words give support to those doctrines which were most intimately sacred to Denney, no such evasion can be admitted: 'Paul not only felt this, he thought it, and thought it out articulately.' I suspect that in this case he was wrong, but, as he once said of Dr. Moffatt, 'he has a right to be wrong, for he is a master in the business.' Very markedly this passion for clearness affected his dogmatic thinking, inclining him in some points to make the world clearer than the Creator has made it. He loved the saying of Vauvenargues that 'an idea which cannot be clearly expressed is not true,' and

accordingly he was suspicious of mysticism of every degree. He charges even Calvin with 'making a mystery out of his own head about the Lord's Supper—a mystery where no mystery should be.' Any talk of the mystical union (which plays so noble a part in much Reformed Theology) annoyed him almost as much as it did Ritschl: 'There is a mystical union, if you like, between a stone and God, but the union of man with God transcends the mystical and rises into the region of the intellectual and moral.'

One more of his characteristics must be noted, as it held to him from youth to age—the curious dash of paganism or, at least, of humanism in a mind so vehemently Christian. He quotes with approbation Amiel's saying: 'It is a real want in a man when his mind is always in Church.' Immediately before coming here as Professor he writes to a friend: 'I want off for a bit to bathe my lungs in air and my brain in paganism.' In one place he sighs for a touch of 'the vitriolic commonsense of Voltaire.' Of a prominent ecclesiastic he remarks: 'I do not think he will be made Moderator. . . . His virtues, for lack of a little vice of some kind, never effervesce or sparkle.' In certain moods he confesses that that blackguard of genius—Benvenuto Cellini—was more interesting to him than the Fathers or the Reformation divines. In this he resembled a Scots commentator of the late eighteenth century who excused himself for reading *Tom Jones* on the plea that 'it was grand stuff for taking the taste of the Apostle out of your mouth'; Denney would never have put it so roughly, but we cannot forget that, alongside of the scholastic and the saint in him, there was this rich element of the humanist, giving spice and savour to all that he said. Robertson Nicoll speaks of a period of Broad Churchism in Denney's career, referring, I suppose, specially to his devastating reply to Drummond's *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. This anonymous pamphlet, which in some ways was the most significant and detached utterance in theology published in Denney's lifetime, was largely an explosion of the humanist in him, encouraged by his experience of common men and common women during his years of mission work in the east end of Glasgow. But, as Job says, 'God enlargeth a nation and straiteneth it again,' and in Denney there was a marked swing back to the scholastic in theology, as is seen in his *Atonement and the Modern Mind* and his *Death of Christ*, great as the virtues of these books may be. In the two supreme achievements of his lifetime—his Commentary on *Romans* and his *Jesus and the Gospel*—both sides of his nature find expression; and

in his unrevised book on *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, published after his death, the humanist struggles hard to gain utterance.

On this endowment so various and so splendid many influences from without were playing, and of these the greatest and most penetrating was that of his wife. It was she who fully liberated in him what Nicoll calls 'his eager tenderness.' Soon after her death he wrote to Nicoll that in their twenty-one years together he had never had a thought in which she had not a part, and as long as he lived she was never absent from his mind; even a good story makes him think of how she would have enjoyed it, and of her merry laugh. She was in every way a notable woman, wholesome, direct, devout, and glad of heart, and she brought him much that in himself he lacked. She urged upon him the scantiness of pathos in his preaching, often telling him, as he confessed, to 'keep down his hand in the pulpit and be gracious.' I remember her telling my mother how she warned her husband that 'a man never knows how dull he can be until he tries to lecture through one of Paul's Epistles.' Six or seven lectures on end she might allow, but then the people ought to have a rest for a week or two. A woman so shrewd and loving and gay could not fail to humanize her husband. They never had a child of their own, but it is beautiful to see how in his *Letters* he reports the ways and words of children, for with this shy scholar—this great man—they always seemed at home.

Then he was enviably rich in friendships, some of them with very notable men. Of his class-mate, Grant of Greenock, it was said by Hugh Mackintosh: 'If all the Churches of the land were to be judged, each by the quality of a chosen representative, I would choose Alexander Duncan Grant to represent the United Free Church, and I should have no fear of the decision.' Inseparably joined to Grant was that man of sparkling genius, J. P. Struthers; and from these two heart friends Denney had no secrets. And there were others—Robertson Nicoll, Carnegie Simpson, Moffatt, and men and women of less distinction—to whom he wrote and spoke without reserve as they did to him, so that his heart and mind were never in risk of stiffening.

But he had also the enriching experience of intimate association with common people. A Professor of Theology who has not been a working minister is scarcely half prepared for his task. When Denney had completed his triumphant career as a student he plunged at once into mission work in the east end of Glasgow, where he spent three years; then, declining the invitation of Troon, he went to

a church in Broughty Ferry, where Bruce had been and where Moffatt was to come, and there he established himself not merely in the admiration but in the affections of his people, so that through the twenty years of his professorship he was looked to by many as still their minister. In the *Letters* it is manifest how his heart went back to the Ferry—to the men and women and the little children; and it is still more manifest that the theology which he taught to his students was the gospel which he had seen at work amongst his people, transforming the simple and building them up in character. He commends the Shorter Catechism as 'an excellent basis not for dogmatic but for evangelizing,' and late in his life he writes to a friend: 'It is my business to teach, but the one thing I covet is to do the work of an evangelist.' With Hezekiah he would have exclaimed: 'O Lord, by these things do men live, and wholly therein is the life of my spirit!'

Finally, in his last years, Denney was drawn into a heroic participation in the public life of the Church. His first appearances in the Assembly had been in defence of the evangelical Reformation doctrine of Scripture, which was threatened by outbreaks of stupid panic, and they were hilariously received, as such speaking, in the quality of it, had scarcely been heard since Robertson Smith; for, like Smith and Rainy, Denney never took part in a debate without making a contribution to the subject. When he joined the Committee for Conference with the Church of Scotland he at first, like others, was provoked by the futility of the discussions; there was so much playing for position, with strong assertions on the one side and the other lest some fragment of cherished testimony should be endangered, and it was freely muttered in the Committee that the chief causes keeping the churches apart were the Secretaries. Denney impatiently asked if the Conference really represented the churches at all, and reckoned that the loss of two working days in College in each month was an exorbitant price for him to pay for all that was done. 'The one hope of Union,' he said, 'is to leave off talking about words, and try whether we cannot agree about things and duties.' When Dr. Archibald Henderson boldly struck out in

this direction, followed by Christopher Johnston (afterwards Lord Sands), Denney bade any one who prayed for the peace of Jerusalem to 'pray specially for the health of Henderson,' who was growing uncomfortably old.

This maxim—'not about words but about things and duties'—was a guiding rule in all Denney's public tasks. His work for the Central Fund carried him into innumerable manses, familiarizing him with the strain and difficulty under which much of the Church's work is done. But another maxim, in supplement of the first, increasingly laid hold upon him. Of Chalmers he had once said that 'he had the greatness of the Nation in him as well as of the Church, and it is an immense gain to a Churchman when he has such an interest in the State as keeps his ethics from becoming ecclesiastically narrow in their range.' This was magnificently evident in Denney throughout the long agony of the War, and his interest in the well-being of the State inspired him in the last campaign in which he engaged. When friends condoled with him because broken health was delaying his Cunningham Lectures, he answered: 'The things I *am* sore about are not being able to help the Temperance cause and the Central Fund.'

Under the shaping of such influences his character was unfolded and enriched. Nature had equipped him splendidly for the rôle of scholar and teacher: a profound personal experience had revealed God to him, so that in God's presence all his thinking and all his activities were conducted. But human love at its noblest, and intimate friendships, and the familiar companionship of plain folk and the discipline of large affairs, all played their part in producing the man we knew, and whom to-day we commemorate. His uniqueness was such that, as Dr. Moffatt has remarked, 'no one can be said even to put you in mind of Denney.' And thus, on this enduring brass, we have inscribed the words: 'Supreme alike as scholar, teacher, administrator, and man of God: to whom many owed their souls.' And from Bunyan we have taken what seems to fit him like a glove: 'My sword I leave to him that shall come after me in pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it.'

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTHSHIRE.

THE influence of Egypt on Israel has often been discussed. It must not be forgotten that it contributed, in some ways at least, to an advance in truth and morality. The ivories, *e.g.*, discovered at Samaria in the royal palace of Ahab are nearly all marked with Egyptian *motifs*, several of which seem to have a distinct connexion with Maât, the goddess of truth, justice, rectitude, integrity, and similar virtues. There is evidence that the doctrine of this goddess received an impetus in the Near East through the conquest of Jerusalem by Sheshonk I. (Biblical 'Shishak'), the first king of the Twenty-second or Libyan Dynasty, who ascended the throne *c.* 945 B.C. It is known that a powerful revival of Egyptian rule followed this conqueror's invasion of Palestine (1 K 14^{25ff}) and continued for many years. Along with it the moral qualities of Maât, which had probably exerted some influence already on Israel, found a new and more abundant entrance, and it is not unlikely that these had some effect on the prophetic schools of Israel, leading them to prefer the sacrifices of 'righteousness' to those of bulls and rams. We know that this preference manifested itself strongly at this period, increasing as time rolled on and occasioning much of the strongest invective. It became the main burden of the prophecy of Amos, and found its classic expression in the well-known words of Micah, 'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly?' etc. (6^{8ff}, cf. Hos 6⁶, Pr 17¹ 21³, etc.). At the same time, the fact remains that, on the whole, the life and religion of the Egyptians had an evil effect on Israel. We have ample proof of this in the amulets or charms which have been recently found in the tombs of Lachish. Many of these certainly received their inspiration from Egypt, while others had been imported from there. Several of them, made of blue glass paste, are images of the god Bes, in his traditional grotesque attitude, while others represent the sacred ram *Khnum*, the cat of the goddess Bast, the sphinxes, and other things. Such magical objects (cf. Is 3²⁰ R.V. 'amulets'), which were believed to protect both the living and the dead against malign influences, have been discovered not only at Lachish but at Gezer, Taanach, Megiddo, and other sites. They show a wonderful variety in form, substance, and colour, and in numerous cases have been traced to

Egyptian influence. At many sites, too, such as Gezer, Megiddo, Samaria, Beth-Shemesh, and others, Egyptian eye-beads ('Horus eyes') have been found. To the Egyptians these chiefly symbolized the sun-god's watchful care and providence, and to the Hebrews or Israelites they must have conveyed the same idea about Yahweh. In such a case they had no baneful association, except when used as amulets or magical objects. God 'sees' the worshipper, and naturally his 'eye' was regarded as the symbol of his watchfulness (cf. Ps 33¹⁸, Ezr 5⁶), and representations of His eye have been found on Hebrew seals. We have but to think also of the many-eyed wheels in Ezekiel's vision (Ezk 10¹², cf. also 1⁸), and the many-eyed cherubim and seraphim in Enoch's (*Secrets of Enoch*, 21¹).

At ancient Mari, the powerful capital of Northern Mesopotamia in the days of Abraham (and also for many centuries before), further evidence of the marvellous culture in this region has been discovered by M. André Parrot, the Director of the French expedition. The great palace, which forms the most complete example of architecture hitherto unearthed in Mesopotamia, must have been the largest of its kind in the third millennium B.C. As at present excavated, it covers more than five acres, with 220 rooms or courts, though a full quarter of the building still remains to be revealed. The number of tablets that have been found stored away in the cupboards or scattered in different rooms has now reached nearly twenty-five thousand, and when these have been fully deciphered (the work has been entrusted to M. Dossin, Professor at Brussels and Liège), our knowledge of the whole story of the Babylonian world in the time of Abraham and Hammurabi will be considerably enlarged. The excavators have discovered the remains of a ziggurat or temple tower in the city. Though only the lower part of it is now in existence, this still reaches a height of nearly fifty feet. The interest of it lies mainly in the fact that there is a temple, in excellent condition, cut in its side. Two ferocious-looking bronze lions (in reality made of wood covered with thin bronze leaf), with snarling jaws and ready to spring, stand at the door, as an intimation that the temple was reserved for the initiated few. Quite a number of sculptured lions (about fifteen, judging from the stone eyes picked up) appear also

to have safeguarded the sanctuary, but all these unfortunately must have been destroyed (probably for the sake of the bronze) when Hammurabi sacked and burned the city (2032 B.C.). They remind us of the lions which adorned the great brazen laver of Solomon's temple (1 K 7²⁹), and which must have been of Babylonian or Mesopotamian origin. According to the tablets, one of the kings (believed to be Zimrilim, who reigned here in Abraham's time) kept a number of live lions. It was not unusual, indeed, for oriental monarchs to have pits or dens with live ones enclosed (cf. 'Darius the Mede,' Dn 6⁷), the animals being used as executioners. The lions of Palestine and Mesopotamia made their homes in thickets (Jer 4⁷), forests (Jer 5⁶), mountains (Ezk 19⁸), and similar haunts; and as they were less formidable than those of the African jungle (being sometimes attacked by shepherds single-handed, cf. 1 S 17^{34ff}), they could often be caught by driving them with loud shouting into nets or pits (cf. Is 31⁴, Ezk 19^{4,6}). Even though 'Darius the Mede,' into whose den of lions Daniel is said to have been cast (Dn 6¹⁶), be a fictitious creation, the result of a mixture of confused traditions (as seems likely), the story of his live lions appears to have an historical basis, for a Persian cylinder-seal in the British Museum (No. 89, 132) gives a picture of Darius (probably Darius the Great, 521-485 B.C.) in his chariot hunting lions in a palm forest, evidently in order to secure them for his den.

In regard to the interpretation of the Lachish Letters, it is interesting to note that the conclusions which we put forward in March last, and which appeared in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May and in the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* for July, have been arrived at also by René Dussaud of the Louvre, the well-known Semitic scholar. In a lecture on the subject given to the Académie des Inscriptions, on April 29th, he regards all the letters as dating just before the fall of Lachish (588 B.C.), and says in effect: 'The prophet mentioned cannot be Uriah, as Professor Torczyner thinks, for this individual was put to death several years earlier. He can only be Jeremiah, and the letters are all the more interesting on this account. Hoshaiab's group, from whom the letters came, consisted of pious Judæans, who were naturally supporters of Jeremiah, and the letters reflect this prophet's views.' The alphabetic script (generally known as the 'Phœnician') used for the letters raises afresh the whole question of writing in these early times. We not only find many new forms of the 'Phœnician' characters, but it is clear that such a script, which had probably been derived from the Proto-Sinaitic one (dating from the

nineteenth century B.C.), was fully developed and in constant use among the Hebrews long before the close of the Jewish monarchy. The greetings contained in the letters and the conventional formulæ used, as well as the mention of other letters received, returned, or forwarded, show that written communications between individuals were common in the land. The script must be the same one used by Jeremiah when he 'wrote in the book' (אִכְתָּב בַּסֵּפֶר, Jer 32¹⁰), and by Baruch when this scribe wrote down Jeremiah's words upon a roll (Jer 36^{2, 4, 28, 32}). It was probably employed by prophets, historians, psalmists, lawgivers, and others, and its development from the Proto-Sinaitic down through the Bronze Age to the Iron one, must have been largely due to the Hebrew race. As some of the examples of it found on bowls and other articles do not appear to be the work of highly cultured persons, it follows that it must have been understood and used by ordinary people. It was only during the Exile that the 'Phœnician' characters fell into disuse among the Hebrews and gave way to the 'Assyrian' form (consisting of square characters of Aramaic origin), which is the one now adopted, and the one used in the earliest manuscripts of the Old Testament that we possess; and ultimately, long before the Christian era, the 'Phœnician' script was abandoned and forgotten, though the Maccabees who relieved the Jews from oppression in the second century B.C. endeavoured to restore it and used it on their coinage. The usual writing material in Old Testament times, especially for sealed messages, was papyrus, which was unfortunately of a perishable nature in the Palestinian climate, and this accounts to a great extent for so few specimens of the script having been discovered, and for so many original documents and state annals having disappeared. Frequently, when papyrus was scarce owing to invasion or other national troubles preventing its import, writers fell back upon potsherds as Hoshaiab, the author of the Lachish Letter, did.

The Wellcome-Marston expedition at Lachish, which is now under the leadership of Mr. Charles Inge, has had another successful season. Notable among the discoveries have been three more examples of the 'Phœnician' script, just referred to, written in ink on fragments of pottery. One has on it five personal names, followed by numerals, which probably represent quantities of oil, wheat, or some other commodity. A second is apparently a receipt, and was found in a room which shows signs of a conflagration. It begins with the words 'In the ninth year,' and as this was the very year of

Zedekiah's reign when Nebuchadrezzar's forces invaded the land anew (after defeating the Egyptian army of Hophra) and finally burned Lachish (588 B.C.), we have an excellent confirmation of the Biblical record (2 K 25¹, 'the ninth year, the tenth month, the tenth day of the month'). The third fragment is a very small one, written on both sides. It begins with the words 'To my lord,' as the eighteen letters found in 1935 do, and is thus a document of the same type. In addition, some scribbings, believed to date about 600 B.C. or a little earlier, and to be the work of a schoolboy, have been found on the vertical face of one of the palace steps. They consist of rectangular lines, a drawing of a lion, and the first five letters of the 'Phœnician' alphabet in their accepted order. We may thus gather that this script was not only in general use, but was probably being taught in the schools as early as the seventh century B.C.

Although numerous temples of imposing grandeur, belonging to the third millennium B.C., have been unearthed in Mesopotamia, it must not be assumed that such buildings, with their professional priests and orderly ritual, existed also in Palestine in these early times. It was not until the Late Bronze Age (1600-1200 B.C.) that temples became common in the latter country. Before this period the sanctuaries were merely open-air shrines ('high places,' Hebrew, *bāmōth*), either outside or inside the city walls. We have an example of such at Bethel, where Jacob set up a sacred stone (Gn 12⁶⁻⁸ 28¹⁸); at Shechem, near which there was a sacred tree in Abraham's time (Gn 12⁶ 33¹⁸⁻²⁰); and at Jerusalem, where the priest of El Elyon brought forth offerings and blessed Abraham (Gn 14^{17π}, Ps 76²). In this early age the sanctuary or 'House of God' consisted simply of one or more pillar-stones, which served both as altars and images; a tree stump or post rudely carved as a rule into a human semblance; a well from which water could be obtained for libations; and often a tumulus where some ancient 'man of God' was buried and whose spirit was believed to brood over the place. The whole sanctuary, being sacred ground, was generally enclosed within a circle of boulders or standing stones. Many of these open-air shrines, such as the Canaanite ones, were connected with Baal and Astarte worship, and were loathsome to the Hebrews on their settlement in the land. They were taken over by them, however, without much change in appearance or form of worship, being merely consecrated in future to the worship of Yahweh. Excavation of such places shows that the old Canaanite type of worship was to some extent

retained, though overlaid by the Israelite one—a fact in harmony with the universal experience of history as to the permanence of sacred sites.

The earliest temple building so far discovered in Palestine (apart from one at Ai, and one believed to have existed at Lachish) is at Shechem, and dates from about 1600 B.C. (the later period of the Hyksos). To a large extent it is an adaptation of the ancient outdoor high-place, for it consists of nine rooms surrounding a large, central, unroofed court. It was only after this time that worshippers in Palestine, influenced by the great neighbouring cultures, especially those of Egypt and Mesopotamia, began to erect suitable structures for religious service. It was probably through the influence of the Nile Valley that they developed such places and adopted a certain amount of style and ritual, and through Mesopotamian connexions that they were led into the cult of the mother-goddess, whose figurines have been discovered in such large numbers.

Remarkable correspondences are still being discovered between the Old Testament and the Ras Shamra tablets. One of the most interesting (to which H. L. Ginsberg has recently drawn attention) is in 2 S 1, where the lamentation of David over the death of Saul and Jonathan is given (being quoted from the 'Book of Jashar'). In v.²¹ we read: 'Ye mountains of Gilboa, let there be no dew nor rain upon you, nor fields of offerings.' This is almost the exact language that occurs in the epic of Dan-el (1 D, 43 ff), where this demi-god, impelled by grief over the death of a beloved friend, calls down a curse of drought on the land: 'Seven years may Baal fail! . . . (Let there be) no dew nor rain, nor upsurging of the Deep [*i.e.* through the springs].' The importance of the identity of expression lies in the fact that, if we write the two parallel sentences out side by side in square Hebrew characters, we notice that the Hebrew words *רִשְׁתִּי הָרִימוֹת* ('nor field of offerings') in the Biblical text, which have proved a difficulty hitherto to Hebrew scholars, are probably miswritten for *רִשְׁתִּי תהמה* ('nor upsurging of the Deep'), as found in the Ras Shamra epic. The identity, moreover, shows that David, if he was the author of the lamentation referred to, had some knowledge of the old Canaanite literature, written at least four hundred years before his day. It is probable that such literature circulated throughout the land, and its spread was aided by the remarkable commercial activity that went on from Phœnicia. Much of the literature (history, epics, mythology, etc.) must have been well known to the Israelite schools of the prophets, and hence the numerous cases of identity of expression on the part of the latter.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Training Your Temper.

BY THE REVEREND C. M. HEPBURN, B.D., MOULIN,
PITLOCHRY.

'Dearly beloved, . . . give place unto wrath.'—
Ro 12¹⁹.

IN writing to the Christian people at Rome St. Paul said, 'Dearly beloved, . . . give place unto wrath.' Of course, that doesn't mean give it a place, but don't give it a place. Don't give way to it. Or perhaps you may remember it better if I put it like this, 'My dear friends, never lose your temper.' 'At any rate, here is how I was reminded of that text. A short time ago I enjoyed a marvellous thrill. There was a great Test Match between the English and Australian teams at Lord's Cricket Ground in London, at which I was lucky enough to be present. In both elevens there were many very fine players, some, indeed, who are famous all over the world. Don Bradman, for instance, who is usually followed about admiringly by a mob of small boys. And on our side, one who is almost his equal—Wally Hammond. But there was another I was anxious to see, Fleetwood-Smith by name. Fleetwood-Smith is what is called a googly bowler, very slow and twisty and tricky. Sometimes a batsman will start smiting his bowling all over the field, but Fleetwood-Smith doesn't get ratty, he simply smiles, and bowls steadily on till the batsman swipes once too often and gets caught out or bowled. And that, undoubtedly, is one of the secrets of his success—not getting rattled, and so losing his length, and bowling rashly. That is why the crowd in Australia call him, so I learned, 'The man who never lost his temper.'

And an excellent reputation it is. I'm afraid it can't always be said of all of us. And it is a pity, for people who flare up in a temper are really a weakness to themselves and their side. On one of Shackleton's expeditions to the Antarctic one of the men was a very fine fellow in every way excepting one, he couldn't apparently control his temper. As a result every one else was set on edge, and Shackleton had to send him back in case he should wreck the expedition. Only good and cool tempered men can stand the trials and silence of the Antarctic. One reason why the heroic men who went with Scott and reached the South Pole did so splendidly

was because, as somebody wrote about them, 'no single hasty or angry word' was spoken by them.

And, of course, the most serious danger in losing one's temper is that it leads us in the heat of the moment to say or do things that may cause grave harm, and it's little good being sorry about it later on. Perhaps the most celebrated Czar of Russia was Peter the Great. But seemingly he had one bad shortcoming. In a fit of temper one day he struck his gardener, and a few days afterwards the gardener died. On hearing about the tragic occurrence, brought about by not controlling his temper, Peter said sadly, 'Alas, I have conquered other nations, but I have not been able to conquer myself.' Yes, truly it is wise to try to train your temper.

And above all, remember that it is the mark of a good Christian to restrain one's temper. It was told of Dr. Aggrey of Africa, one of the gentlest and most lovable negroes who ever lived, that in his early days as a teacher he would sometimes break out into awful tempers against the pupils, giving way to sharp words and even blows. But, by and by, after becoming a Christian he gained perfect control over himself. And do you know what his motto was, when many a time people slighted him and sneered at him because he was black?—'Keep your temper and smile.' Isn't that just what any good follower of Jesus Christ should seek to do? How wonderful His example was. As the Bible says, 'Who, when He was reviled, reviled not again: when He suffered, He threatened not.' So whether in cricket or in the greater game of life, will you also try not to lose your temper, but 'give place unto wrath.'

Rubbish.

BY W. RHYDDERCH EVANS, LOGIN S.O.,
CARMARTHENSHIRE.

'There is much rubbish.'—Neh 4¹⁰.

A schoolmaster and his class made up their minds to break all the school records by making a 100% attendance for a whole month. The first week they succeeded; the second week also had a full attendance; the third week ended without a single black mark on the register; the fourth week came, and the first day saw every child present; so did the second day; but alas! on the third day two children—a brother and a sister—were absent.

The record was lost! Was the master angry? I should say he was. He shouted (as masters do when they are annoyed), and promised the culprits a bad time. Indeed, so angry was he that he went home that evening past the children's home; and it so happened that as he approached, the two children met him. Their faces were black with soot and perspiration, but they smiled happily. Little did they know what was in store for them! The storm-clouds began to gather around the master's face.

'Why were you two absent from school to-day?' he demanded.

'Oh sir,' was the reply, 'we were absent because we are moving into a new house and we have been burning the rubbish of the old.'

Their master said not a word. He just nodded his head and passed on, but that reply has kept ringing in his ears until this very moment.

'Moving into a new house and so burning the rubbish of the old!'

Now, was not that a wise thing to do?

Of course it was! And yet how many of us, I wonder, fail to do just that very thing, for you see, when we carry the hatreds, the failings, the quarrels, the bad tempers of yesterday into to-day, what are we doing but carrying the rubbish of the old house into the new?

Again, the nations of the world, when we see them holding on to the enmities and the misunderstandings of the past, we see them carrying the rubbish of the old house into the new.

Now, whatever else we know about rubbish, we know at least three things: First, rubbish is something which has lost its usefulness. Take a look into the dust-bin! There you see pots and pans, tins and cans, all of which have lost their usefulness and so have become rubbish. Second, rubbish is something which has lost its value. 'If the salt have lost its savour—it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out.' It has lost its usefulness, and so its value, and it has become rubbish. Third, rubbish always takes up the room of something better. When mother has finished spring cleaning, have you noticed there is always more room for things? Shall I tell you why? Because all the rubbish has been cleared away. When Nehemiah looked about him, he cried, 'There is much rubbish.' We can say the same, but as we move from day to day, let us remember the children's answer and do likewise. 'We are moving into a new house and so we are burning the rubbish of the old.'

The Christian Year.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Harvest Thanksgiving Sermon.

BY THE REVEREND J. G. GRANT FLEMING, D.S.O.,
M.C., M.A., ABERDEEN.

'Moreover the profit of the earth is for all: the king himself is served by the field.'—Ec 5⁹.

'Give us this day our daily bread.'—Mt 6¹¹.

'Look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest.'—Jn 4³⁵.

These three texts underline for us the message of Harvest, a message which is specially appropriate to a service, where with praise and prayer, with the service of thought and gifts which we have brought for others, we celebrate the gathering in of the fruits of the earth.

From earliest times men have marked this great yearly beneficence with one observance and another. For the Harvest so fulfilled the year's hopes and so crowned the year's toils that men simply could not let it pass with unmoved hearts, without expressing somehow their thankfulness. And so when the fields had been fully reaped and the last sheaf triumphantly garnered, then they brought some of the fruits as an offering to the great Creator. In Christian times men gathered in their hamlets to hold their Harvest Homes, and in their churches they came together for thanksgiving and praise.

It is well that we too should not allow this season to pass unmarked, for amid the complexities and artificialities of our modern life the Harvest brings us back to three primary truths—three truths of which we ought to be reminded over and over again—three simple and primary truths: the first, a truth of simple observation; the second, a truth of simple faith; and the third, a truth of simple duty.

The first is seen in our first text. It comes to us from Ecclesiastes, who was a realist, one who saw things in their stark reality without any glamour of romance, one who saw and told of the plain and obvious facts about life, and here in our text he tells the unvarnished truth about the Harvest: 'The profit of the earth is for all: the king himself is served by the field.' And what he means is just this: that we are in the last resort utterly dependent on the farmers of the field. That is a truth which is being underlined for us in this uncertain, difficult age in which we live.

There is an old story of a man who had gathered much riches and gold; and his fellow-citizens used to hold him in a kind of reverence and envy him for the means he had of gratifying every desire. But one year the Harvest failed, and there was a

famine in that little land, and the man's store of gold was as rubbish in his hands, and in presence of the lack of bread he was no better off than his poorest neighbours. Yes, even the king himself is served by the field. And however men may amass wealth or earn wages, still all their wealth and all their wages would be as nothing unless the earth bestowed its Harvest gift. It should be a humbling thought to those who sometimes bear themselves loftily and disdainfully, a humbling and a healthy thought to recall how utterly they would be dependent on the common earth in a time of crisis, on the rough-handed men who in winter's cold and summer's heat till the land and sow the seed, and reap the ripened fruits. For even the king himself is served by the field.

The profit of the earth is for all. It is a strange thing to reflect—commonplace though it be—that if, even for one year, the earth withheld her gifts, then all our stores of learning and invention, all our gathered treasure, all our slowly built-up civilization, yes, even the race of humankind itself, would all go down in darkness and everlasting night. We can well understand how St. Francis long ago addressed the earth in words like these :

Dear Mother Earth, who day by day
Unfoldest blessings on our way.

'For the profit of the earth is for all: the king himself is served by the field.' But is this plain, obvious truth about the Harvest which Ecclesiastes saw and told the whole story? Is it all the truth? Is there not an even greater and more wondrous truth beyond it? Yes, of course there is, and all down the generations men have felt that there is: they speak forth this truth as they breathe these words from the Lord's Prayer: 'Give us this day our daily bread.' As in spring, year after year, they watched the infant blades of corn adorning the earth in a lovely mantle of green; as in autumn, year after year, they saw the fertile plains covered with a golden sea of waving grain; as they watched that steadfast giving each returning year and reaped the Harvest, their thoughts went forth beyond this dumb impassive earth, went forth to Him who gave so much. Behind the gifts of earth they saw God's hand wide open, giving liberally; and behind the steadfast fidelity of earth they heard His voice make promise saying: 'While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest shall not cease.'

The mercies of God, 'ever faithful, ever sure.' That is the second truth about the Harvest, and it makes the Harvest very wonderful, does it not? The simple fact of Harvest is itself a wonderful

thing, that year after year throughout the ages the earth should unfailingly bring forth her fruits and give them to man's needs—that is very wonderful. But it becomes far more wonderful when we remember it has its changeless prompting and its changeless security in the faithfulness of God. Every time we walk by autumn fields rich with Harvest, we can say, 'That is the Heavenly Father giving us our daily bread.' And every time we sit at table, that same daily bread can be to us another messenger of the Divine care and love.

But these two simple truths together speak forth a third—the lesson of a simple duty. There is no Harvest without faithfulness in this way. If the profit of the field is for all and God's care and thought for us so wonderful, our thankfulness will surely be one of loving service? Our response will be a glad one in which we shall seek to share the joy and gladness of our faith in God's gracious thought for us with others. We shall see that the treasures of the field are indeed made available for all, especially for the poor and needy: 'Distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven,' said Christ. 'We shall do our best to ensure that every one has the right to earn his daily bread, that no one hungers, no one suffers from want or poverty. As we pray, 'Give us our daily bread,' we shall make certain that others share in God's glorious blessings, for every one, as well as the king, ought to be served by the field.

And one of our first cares will be to prepare for another Harvest; by sowing the good seed in this and other ways; and perhaps for all who love the Master and seek to serve Him, the best way will be to dedicate ourselves to service in the great Harvest field of Christ's Kingdom. It is only by bringing men to Him who is the Harvester of souls that the true blessings of the Heavenly Father's love can be known. The reason for this is not far to seek, for over every Harvest field there is a shadow, the shadow of death—death that will spring forth again in new life certainly, but still death. And the need for men and women who will give themselves to the duty of winning others for Jesus Christ is tragically apparent to-day, for if the Harvest that the Spirit has promised us is not wrought for, famine and death may be our portion in this strife-ridden world. Every one has a simple, yet imperative duty in this great Harvest—to win men from death unto life. Let us be servants of Him who has shown us how God cares for all, rich and poor, high and low; who taught us to pray for our daily bread; and who in His life and death gave Himself for the harvesting of the souls of men.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Two Eternities.

'God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross.'—Gal 6¹⁴.

On a day that was not yesterday, nor the day before it, a little company of men and women sat by the lip of the sea that washed a Western isle. They were waiting for an emigrant ship. Steep above the bay rose a green hill. And because they had nothing else to do the young men climbed it. There they built a rough cairn, and on it, as though in response to some deep imaginative instinct, they set a wooden cross, a memorial to that hour of parting and adventuring. 'It stands,' they said to the old folk left behind, 'for our pain and sorrow and for our hope of victory as well.' Then they sailed away. But every year on the anniversary of that July morning their fathers and mothers gathered round the rude cross, and prayed to God for their dear sons that their heart-pain might be small, and the face of fortune kind.

Now the Cross is one of the inescapable facts of our experience. 'After you are forty years of age,' a modern mystic tells us, 'look out for a cross. Sometimes you have merely to carry it. Sometimes your spirit is nailed to it, but at all times you have to accept it.' It is the very marrow of truth. There is the cross of ill-health. There is the cross of the broken dream. Its fragments lie at your feet, and as you look at them you know that no magician can piece them into oneness and beauty again. There is the cross of doubt, about those tremendous facts—God: His Son: the future life, and that happy country which lies beyond the horizon of those dark hills we call death. For faith is an immortal bird that must be for ever on the wing of love and prayer. Put it into the imprisoning cage of care and custom, and then, when some day you open the cage, you discover that the poor bird has lost its power of flight. And, to take one other, there is the cross of the bitter knowing, and that is the knowing that you are not loved for yourself alone. From this random list we turn with a mingled sense of relief and triumph to the Cross of Christ. We watch Him, with a new and instant happiness in our heart, dying there. We feel like the fabled giant who stepped from mountain to mountain murmuring, 'If only they below could see as I see, they would feel exalted and glad.' We share in the rapture-cry of Paul, 'God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of my Lord Jesus Christ.' And all this for this reason. The secret of the Cross is the Christ who died on it. He is the meaning of the Cross. He is

the glory of the Cross. He is the victory of the Cross.

If we wish to put meaning and glory and victory into the simplest English then we may say that Jesus on His Cross is the proof of the two eternities that meet in us. The first is the eternity of spirit. The second is the eternity of love. These are the twin suns that shine above the Crucified. Is our ultimate splendour, and everybody's, not that we are able to say, 'I have this or this or this. I have securities and good investments. I have a brain that is tempered and fine. I have personality. I have influence or charm or a genius for friendship,' but that we take our stand under the Cross and are able to say, 'I am like my Lord and Saviour. I am a spirit immortal, and in this spirit of mine I salute the power of an immortal love'? We can say with Tatian, 'I am above fate'; or with Hector Dunoisie 'I am greater than a thousand kings. I am a man for whom Christ died and in whom Christ is now alive.'

The notes of this spirit in us are so clear and valiant indeed that they are not to be mistaken. The first is *Christ's passion in us for truth*: the truth about ourselves; about the world we live in; about the balance of dues we must pay our body and our mind alike; about our mental sincerity; about our faith in brotherhood as being the only possible way to happiness; about God's fatherhood as being the one fact that gives us that inner quiet and sets us free from the shackles of doubt and care. Jesus says, 'Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. He invites us to share His mind and spirit so that we may make the discovery that our faith is not merely a tower of refuge, but a bridge as well—a bridge across which we may adventure into the territories of truth and freedom. The less we know of God the less vital is our faith in His kindness and goodness, the less He stands for in our scheme of things. The more we know, the more our reverence, the finer the quality of our happiness, the deeper our awareness that with the new strength that is in us we can wait until He tells His secret, and draws the veil of mystery aside. Here is a delivering fact that has no equal in science or philosophy—we may know the truth about God. It is possible for our minds to arrive at such a knowing of His mind and of His thought about us that the wonder of it fills our whole being with light and gladness.

But what positive things can we know about God? The answer is that we can know what Jesus knew. And that is this: God is a Spirit, mysterious, living, creative, and unreachable, except by that

part of Him which is in our spirit. And God is the Holy One. Everything in Him and of Him is perfect. And He is the Infinite and all-embracing Mind, which means that we are not alone upon this universe. There is One who reads our secret purpose towards good. There is One who knows our struggle with the self of our flesh. There is One who smiles when joy comes knocking at our door. What a thought of splendour! How that cry of Robert Leighton stirs us to a new recognition of the Divine in us. 'The greatest affairs surcharge Him not and the very smallest escape Him not. He orders the march of armies and the events of battles. Yet thou and thy particular condition slip not out of His view.'

The second note of the eternal spirit in us is *Christ's passion for justice*. The foundation of this justice lies deep hidden in our secret thought. But it must not stay there. It must flow forth into speech and deed. We must be its heralds. And this most of all in how we think of others or speak of them or judge them. We have to be just and kind to our neighbour. We have to conquer the lower self with the strength that faith and true prayer pass into our spirit. We have to reproduce in thinking, in speech, and in decisions something of the tenderness that glows in Jesus, something of His uncompromising straightness: something of His scorn for falsehood; something of the magnificence of His charity.

The third note of this spirit in us is what we may call the *note of a progressive harmony*—harmony between our mind and the mind and the will of God. Not that the harmony will ever be a perfect thing; for as long as our spirit must conduct its business within the framework of physical conditions there are bound to be discords and jars. Yet as we feel and recognize that year by year our mind is entering into living peace, that the power which things have over us grows less and less, that simplicity and friendship and delight in all loveliness are the good companions of the soul, that giving, whether of our mind or of our money, is the most enriching exercise in all the world, that the awareness of the Divine Spirit housed in our own is joy's crown of joy—as we feel all this, and know it for reality, the tumult and the shouting dies, we walk along a pathway of light; our heart sings a happy measure; we have reached the place where our life is hid with God in Christ.

Here, then, is the inward meaning of the Cross. Jesus died on it. And by His dying, He shows us that evil is a conquerable thing and sin a forgivable thing, and that we are rulers over two eternal

empires, the empire of spirit and the empire of love.¹

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Challenge.

'Whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him twain.'—Mt 5⁴¹ (R.V.).

About five hundred years before the birth of Christ, when the Israelites were in captivity in Babylon, there lived a Persian king named Cyrus. So great was his power to frame law that we can trace some of our modern legislation—such as military conscription—right back through the Romans and Greeks to his legal code.

There was no organized postal system, and Cyrus invented one. Sometimes the messenger would require help, so legislation was effected giving him power to press into the king's service man, beast, or boat.

The Romans had been greatly influenced by the Persians, both in religious and social custom. Indeed, at the time of Christ, compulsory service was prevalent throughout the Empire. Wherever the courier went he could command service for the Emperor. But the law of compulsory service had much wider application than this. When the cohort passed through any district, the inhabitants were compelled to carry the baggage a mile in and a mile out of the village. Roman troops had the power to requisition able-bodied men as porters, guides, and servants. Such was the justification by which Simon of Cyrene was compelled to carry the Cross. Probably Christ had seen many a man who formed part of His audience pressed into the royal service against his will. In any case, the disciples knew perfectly well to what He alluded when He spoke of the second mile. He was taking a legal custom to enforce a moral truth.

'Whoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him twain.'

1. *Man does not express the fullness of his personality by living upon the average plane.* When living on the average plane, man's record has ever been one of failure. The Bible lays particular emphasis on this. Its whole story is one of divine forbearance with men living below their capacity.

Jesus once drew a very clear distinction between this idea of merely existing and of living the full life. 'If thou wouldst enter into life, keep the commandments.' Now that is the average plane, the respectable convention, the first mile. But what of the

¹ A. Maclean, *Walk in the Light*, 242.

next? 'If thou wouldst be perfect, go sell.' Ah! That is more than a Commandment. It is in excess of what is expected. Get beyond the legal standard. Strive on to the goal of the second mile. Conventional living may be respectable, but it is never heroic. The line of least resistance may be safe, but it is never brave. Christianity is God's provision for a world in a mediocre state. The gospel is Christ's gift for a spiritually starved humanity. Our text is a challenge to conventional morality. It demands that we should rise above the normal. No life comes to its own in any other way.

2. *The natural man is ever satisfied with the average standard.* Normal manhood is enough for him. Dr. H. F. Sanders said, 'It would seem that the public conscience has always tended to be lower than the Christian ideal, and the result invariably has been a compromise between the vision of the best men and the easy going habits of the majority.'

In the long human story it seems that the world has little use for those who live outside the realm of the average standard. Those who are below, it penalizes; those who are above, it martyrs. That is why it came to be that Barabbas and Jesus were found on a day together. Outlaws and prophets are exiles to the world's convention, and both are equally condemned. That is why the dungeons of history have held life's two extremes—the worst and the best. And so Newgate in 1662 held many a rogue and many a saint. Listen to William Dewsbury, enfeebled after nineteen years imprisonment: 'In the prison home I sang praises to God, and esteemed the bolts and locks put upon me as jewels.' Such was the spirit of Bunyan in Bedford, and George Fox in Worcester. The perpetual problem of a world living in a lesser plane has been to find place for the men who drag behind the first mile, and those who push on to the second. Society is ever satisfied with the dead level of mediocrity. 'Our innermost temptation,' says Dr. Fosdick, 'is to reduce ourselves to the lowest common denominator, to sink ourselves to the ecclesiastical average to help to put down the worst in men, but at the same time to miss the best. The hope of the Church lies in leadership above the average and ahead of the time.'

3. *It is in response to the challenge of the second mile that Christian character is wrought.* In the last analysis, the difference between the average man and the great heart is not a difference of gift, or talent, it is a difference of character.

One thinks, for instance, of the two great characters of the Reformation—Erasmus and Luther,

the two souls who kindled the smouldering embers of religious zeal into a white hot flame. But we think of them in very different ways. For the one we have admiration, for the other, reverence. Erasmus, in the dark day of his visitation, said, 'I intended to be true to truth as far as the times would allow.' Luther, in the assembly of princes and papal legates at Worms, answers Eck, 'I retract nothing except I be convinced from the Scripture. Here I take my stand. God help me.' Erasmus trembled at the further step, whilst Luther took it. It is the last step that is the test of character. Are we forgiving beyond requirement? Are we more faithful than our vows? Are we juster than the Law? Let us rouse ourselves to that test, for it is in response to the challenge of the second mile that Christian character is made.

4. So we would urge this higher life because *it is the two-mile manhood that has achieved the best in the past, and is the hope of the future.*

The Church has received her full measure of criticism in this age, and some of it she may have deserved, but despite it all, let it be remembered that with all her faults, she has been the comfort of the world, she has mothered the race, and saved the people. In the arena, and in the catacombs, through the Inquisition, and out with the Mayflower the pilgrims have kept their vigil, and the light has never been dimmed. They it is who have carried the lamp the second mile—sometimes singing, sometimes fainting, sometimes struggling, but always advancing. The romance of history, the glory of the past, the vitality of the ages have been but the strength of the worthy sons of the second mile.

We go on our daily round gathering our little sum of earthly good, and at times we are weary of it all. Yet we can get something more out of life than this. But we can do it, not by drawing out, but by plunging further in. The Christian ideal is a challenge to further achievement. The weariness of the first mile is overcome by adding the romance of a second.

To every man there openeth
A Way, and Ways, and a Way,
And the High Soul climbs the High Way,
And the Low Soul gropes the Low,
And in between, on the misty flats,
The rest drift to and fro.
But to every man there openeth
A High Way, and a Low.
And every man decideth
The Way his soul shall go.¹

¹ E. E. Johnston, *The Puritan Heritage*, 17.

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Christian Morality.

'What do ye more than others?'—Mt 5⁴⁷.

What *do ye more* than others? A very searching and disturbing question.

Two preliminary words concerning this urgent and vital matter. First, that the ultimate Christian test is a moral test. Not an ecclesiastical test, nor a theological test, but a character test. Mankind has always found it easier to be religious than to be good. It is not, 'Do ye believe more confidently or accept more unquestioningly?' but 'What *do ye*?' And the other thing is: that the test is positive and not negative. So many well-meaning people have been content to define themselves in terms of what they don't do: to affirm their Christianity, and claim superiority, by virtue of the things they abstain from doing, the things they have given up. But Jesus Christ never based Christian character on what we don't do but on what we do. Of course, there are many things that we ought not to do. But there are two ways of not doing them. The first, by making a list of them and avoiding them: the other by accepting a splendid vision of duty—or of something higher and more compelling than duty—and taking a path that winds uphill all the way, conquering the evil by 'the expulsive power of a new affection.'

Clearly, our Lord's expectation and canon of judgment is that His gospel would not only produce character, but better character. It is not only in essence 'doing,' but 'doing more.'

As Christians He expected them to be better: to live, and to impress the world with a new, a better type of life. There can be no question that they did, or there would be no Christian morality to discuss. Christianity would never have been a success if Christians had not succeeded in convincing their world that they had something that the world had not. It wasn't the—the Greeks, fantastic—assertion of the resurrection of Christ that wrought this great wonder of history, primarily. No; the thing that impressed that world was the Risen Life shining through. 'What do ye *more* than others?' It is by 'the more' that the world judges us, and is entitled to judge us. It is by 'the more' that our Lord judges us.

Now it is evident, from our Lord's affirmation here, that others really 'do.' It is unjust, and it is untrue, either to deny or belittle that. When St. Paul writes to the Romans, 'When the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are

a law unto themselves; which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness'—he affirms not only the existence of a natural conscience, an indelible instinct of right and wrong, but he affirms a very real recognition of it in circles far beyond the limits of Christianity.

And yet Christ expects of us 'more than others.' How are we to define the 'more?' Where are we to look for it? Is it by adding to the list of virtues? Doubtless Christ added to the content of morality and raised the actual precepts of morality. And it is not more than the truth to say that it was Christianity that democratized virtue, that opened the way of the highest to the lowest, as that Greek world had never dreamed it to be possible. 'Virtue,' in those days, was almost a class distinction.

All this is true, and it is a great truth; but it is not on this side that we must seek the real key of our problem. For the crux of Christianity is not in its popularity, but in its essence: not in the number of people, and the type of people, who come to accept its teachings, but in its principles. Its principles always rather than its precepts.

'What do ye more than others?' What were the others doing? Do we remember that Epictetus the Stoic, who, as far as we know, came into no contact with Christianity at all, wrote the following: 'My duty to my father is to take care of him . . . but you will say, he is an unjust and unnatural father. What is that to the purpose? This obligation of duty does not arise from the consideration of his goodness but from the relation he bears you.'

Or, the noble list of virtues Marcus Aurelius gathers into a single sentence for which he thinks a man ought to strive. 'Sincerity, seriousness, endurance of labour, aversion to pleasure, contentment with thy portion and with few things, benevolence, frankness, no love of superfluity, freedom from trifling, magnanimity.' Who of us would venture to claim that we had achieved these virtues, that we had done even as much as 'others.' But it appears that even if we had achieved all these excellencies, our Lord might still ask, 'What do ye *more* than they?'

The only answer to this problem that can satisfy our hearts and consciences comes from a realization that behind Christ's disturbing word 'What' here, stands a vital 'Why.' For behind this whole problem of a specifically Christian morality and conduct lies the question of *motive*. It is not primarily—or ultimately—a question of what I do, but of why I do it. It is not a question, fundamentally, of attainment, but of ideal. Our Lord Himself not only authorized, but enforced, this

unique criterion of Christian conduct when, speaking of John the Baptist, He said: 'I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is *least* in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.'

Secular morality, however high, has its limits clearly defined. Few, if any, ever reach those limits. For a Christian even to reach those limits would be a great achievement. But with Christian character the point is that, with the motive once securely grasped, there are no limits. For Christianity, on the practical side, does not consist chiefly in aiming at a few great things, but in doing all things in a great way, a new way, from a new motive. It is not an ethic, but a life, in which

Dross becomes gold, and as of old,
The water turns to wine.

'Love your enemies.' It is hard. To forgive them: not to wish them any harm. That we might do. But to *love* them! And yet it is conceivable that Marcus Aurelius and Epictetus might have *said* it. Love them, serve them, they seem to say, as a stern duty. Is it not high? It is. Have we reached there? But few of us. Is there anything nobler than loving enemies? No! 'For God commendeth his love to us, that while we were yet enemies, Christ died for us.' Even God has no higher end. But there is a *better way* of loving them, a surer and more enduring way. It is loving them for Christ's sake. At the very heart of this probing question of our Lord's is implicit the question of *motive*. Loving, doing, being, for Christ's sake. 'Whoso loseth his life for my sake'—that is the root principle of Christian morality: the solution of the problem of the Christian 'more.'

Urgent and cogent as duty is, and imperishable as

the law of conscience would appear to be, yet within the shadow of mere duty there always lurks that ominous word *Why?* It is raising its voice disturbingly and rather clamorously to-day, in much of our drama and literature.

Why suffer? Why sacrifice? Why surrender? Why trample upon inclination and instinct? Why not seek your own things and let the rest look out for themselves?

Who would say that duty has no imperative answer? For many it has: for a certain high type of soul, always. But, behind Christian morality, behind the highest and hardest demands of Christian character, is the impregnable buttress of the strongest thing in earth or heaven—love.

The greatest virtue that some of us possess is not any of the moral attainments that might conspicuously distinguish us from others, but just the supreme virtue of going on, of trudging painfully but confidently along the rising way: of hoping for ourselves, because *He* goes on hoping for us and bearing with us, and calling us His own. Remembering that Paul even called himself 'the chief of sinners,' not because he was worse than other people (far from it!), but because now he no longer measured himself against the most exalted and exacting standard of human virtue, but against Jesus Christ. Indeed, it may be said that the one supreme addition to morality that Christ made is that of a new and unique kind of faith. Faith in Him based on love of Him; and, therefore, an entirely new faith in ourselves. What do ye more than others? We believe in Him: we love Him.

Talk they of morals, O Thou dying Lamb?
The true morality is love of Thee.¹

¹ H. E. Brierley, *Life Indeed*, 214.

Contributions and Comments.

'House' and 'Home' in New Testament Greek.

IN the Greek of the New Testament two cognate words are used, ΟΙΚΟΣ and ΟΙΚΙΑ, both commonly translated indifferently as 'house.' That both words are derived from a common root and that both on occasion have this meaning in classical Greek requires no argument: that they are used

indifferently in the New Testament may be questioned. If we may invoke the aid of the comparative method, we may observe that in English 'hospital,' 'hostel,' and 'hotel' all descend to us from a common source, yet however uneducated and unlettered a speaker is amongst us he will never be found confusing these three words. This suggests then the propriety of examining without prejudice or prepossession the way in which the two Greek words we are considering are actually used

in the New Testament. A detailed review of all the instances of their occurrence would be tedious here, it must suffice to record in a summary form the results of a careful scrutiny, and then to offer a few observations on some interesting examples where, if the distinction here suggested should prove sound, some points of historical interest seem to emerge.

Briefly then it may be said that οἶκος means 'home'; it is used of the Temple where English phrase prefers to speak of God's house, though strictly the Greek calls it His home. Moreover, it is used by a natural development for a man's household, or better, 'home folk' or family. Where classical Greek said οἶκος, 'at home,' the New Testament writes ἐν (τῷ) οἴκῳ, and similarly for the classical οἶκος the New Testament following the same analytical usage has εἰς (τὸν) οἶκον.

ΟΙΚΙΑ means 'house,' regarded as a mere building without implying or at any rate insisting that it is a man's 'home.' Hence εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ἐν (τῇ) οἰκίᾳ, merely mean 'indoors' as opposed to 'out in the open air,' whether in the unpeopled country or by the seaside or elsewhere.

A clear example of the distinction is to be found in Mk 7²⁴ 'in a house' and ³⁰ 'come home.'

In Mk 10²⁹ our Lord speaks of the man who has given up 'a house'—not his home or family, after which, had it been so said, brother or sister or mother would have been tautologous. That our Lord should put the house in the forefront suggests, if I may dare to express what it brings to my mind, that our Lord like St. Joseph before Him was not a carpenter but as has been inferred from the use in the papyri, an architect—a conclusion supported perhaps by the way in which illustrations are drawn by our Lord from the building on the rock and on the sand (Mt 7^{24, 26}), from the hasty inception of building without sufficient means (Lk 14²⁸), and the building of the Church upon such faith as Peter exhibited (Mt 16¹⁸). This will lend an added intimacy to the conservation about the lengthy building of the Temple and the speedy rebuilding of the human frame which housed Deity (Jn 2¹⁹⁻²⁰), and the disciples' comments on the beauty of the Temple buildings (Mk 13¹).

The healing of the paralytic would seem to have taken place in our Lord's home at Capernaum (Mk 2¹), which agrees with St. Matthew's statement (4¹³) that our Lord transferred His home from Nazareth to Capernaum before the call of St. Peter and his partners to be trained for their apostleship, a statement indirectly confirmed by St. Luke (4³⁰⁻³¹ and 5⁸).

In our Lord's home at Capernaum also the disciples asked why they could not exorcise the evil spirit which possessed the epileptic boy (Mk 9²⁸), which again may reasonably be connected with St. Matthew's story that it was at this time in Capernaum that the disciples were rebuked for disputing about their respective rank (Mt 18^{ff}, Lk 9^{46ff}, and Mk 9³³, the last reference showing that the incident occurred indoors and at Capernaum).

A word of comment may be given to the form in which one of our Lord's sayings appears in the three synoptic evangelists. 'A house divided against itself' appears in St. Matthew and St. Luke in a form which would dwell upon the physical condition of a building—let us say after an earthquake or the rain, the flood and the wind of the Sermon on the Mount. St. Luke more naturally speaks of a household or family (Mt 12²⁵, Mk 3²⁵ and Lk 11¹⁷).

The centurion's servant lay ill not 'at home,' as the A.V. has it¹ (perhaps still following in the train of the ambiguous Vulgate *domus*), but 'in the house,' a form of expression which will seem still more natural if account be taken of St. Luke's extended narrative corrective of St. Matthew's more concise summary which follows the legal maxim 'QUI FACIT PER ALIUM, FACIT PER SE.'

One or two final observations may be offered. It is obvious that both 'house or home' may be used of the same building with however a slight change of emphasis, thus in Mt 24⁴³ the householder would not have allowed his 'house' to be broken into, where St. Luke speaks of his 'home' (12³⁹). To receive a visitor or guest into the 'home' implies more intimacy than into the 'house,' and so where a visitor comes to stay the night οἶκος is generally used, while when he comes for an odd meal ΟΙΚΙΑ² is usual. In conclusion it should be mentioned that St. John twice uses ΟΙΚΙΑ in a way that deserves comment: in 14² he makes our Lord say that in His father's ΟΙΚΙΑ are many mansions;

¹ The R.V. has changed this to 'in the house,' but it has not consistently drawn out the distinction we are considering (in Mk 2¹ it has 'in the house').

² In Ac 2⁴⁶ and 5⁴² κατ' οἶκον has been translated in the A.V. 'from house to house' and 'in every house,' evidently influenced by the Vulgate 'circa domos'; the R.V. has 'at home.' The correctness of this translation or 'in their homes' is corroborated by Ro 16⁵, 1 Co 16¹⁹, and several other passages, and it seems clear that St. Luke is indicating how this original practice of the Church in Jerusalem differed from that followed and perhaps originated in Corinth (1 Co 11 18-22, Ac 20⁷). In Ac 20³⁰ κατ' οἴκους is 'in your various homes.'

here οΙΚΟC¹ would naturally have meant the earthly Temple. In 4⁵³ he states that the man believed, and his whole οΙΚΙΑ: perhaps he felt that οΙΚΟC would suggest the family only and not the servants. St. Paul and St. Luke must have included family and slaves in οΙΚΟC (Ac 16¹⁵, 1 Co 1¹⁶, Col 4¹⁵), but St. Paul in Ph 4²² uses οΙΚΙΑ where plainly there is not likely to have been any question of members of the Emperor's family.² T. NICKLIN.

Ringwood, Hants.

Genesis i. and John i. 1-14.

It is impossible for any one to be blind to the exact correspondence of the opening words of those two chapters—'In the beginning God' and 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,'

¹ The distinction urged in the text lends support to the suggestion that the Temple was the scene of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on Whitsunday (Ac 2³) (the house).

² It is to be noticed that in He 3²⁻⁶ the erection of a material building is not in the author's thought, but the founding of a family.

and the Word was God'—in both 'In the beginning God.' But is there not reason to think that John had more of the story of Creation in his mind than simply what follows. 'All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made.' Made by whom? The Word! 'God said.' And what was the first thing God said? God said, 'let there be light: and there was light.' What corresponds with this in the case of Word? 'In him was life; and the life was the light of men.' And just as at the Creation all at first was chaos, so here 'the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.' The parallel is not carried farther in detail. But is it forcing things to see analogy, which is at the same time contrast, once more in the climax—'And God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our likeness,' and 'the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us'? The crowning fact in the first creation was man made in the image of God. The crowning fact in the new creation was that God 'took upon himself the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men.'

ROBERT J. DRUMMOND.

Edinburgh.

Entre Nous.

Our Fiftieth Year.

With the next number THE EXPOSITORY TIMES begins its fiftieth year, and we hope to make something special of the occasion. For twelve months general surveys will be given of subjects that are live to-day, with a comparison of what the situation was fifty years ago. This AFTER FIFTY YEARS Series will be begun in October by Principal Vincent Taylor writing on 'The Gospel and the Gospels.' Sir F. G. Kenyon will follow on 'The Text of the Greek New Testament'; Professor T. H. Robinson on 'Higher Criticism and the Prophetic Literature'; Professor E. O. James on 'Aspects of Sacrifice in the Old Testament'; Professor W. D. Niven on 'Eschatology and Primitive Christianity'; and the Rev. Norman H. Snaith on 'The Background of the Psalms.'

In GREAT TEXTS RECONSIDERED, great New Testament passages, which have been the subject

of controversy, will be chosen. The first study—in October—will be by Professor J. M. Creed.

'Pacifism' has been undertaken by the Bishop of Liverpool; 'Christian Preaching and Sin,' by Professor T. H. Robinson; 'The Non-Christian East in the Christian West,' by Dr. Nicol Macnicol; 'The Church and the Child,' by Dr. F. J. Rae. These will have their place in PROBLEMS OF TO-DAY.

Recent social experiments will continue to be described. Mr. Clarence E. Pickett, of the American Friends' Service Committee, will be the next contributor to CHRISTIANITY IN ACTION.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.